The SONG of SONGS

A Symposium

Central BAPTIST
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

DM 80
Sch 63

THE SONG OF SONGS

A Symposium

PRESS OF
THE COMMERCIAL MUSEUM
PHILADELPHIA

THE SONG OF SONGS

A Symposium

By

MAX L. MARGOLIS,
JAMES A. MONTGOMERY,
WALTER WOODBURN HYDE,
FRANKLIN EDGERTON,
THEOPHILE J. MEEK,
AND WILFRED H. SCHOFF

Before the Oriental Club of Philadelphia

WILFRED H. SCHOFF
EDITOR

PHILADELPHIA:
PUBLISHED BY THE COMMERCIAL MUSEUM
1924

LIBRARY
CENTRAL BAPTIST SEMINARY
KANSAS CITY 2, KANSAS

IN AFFECTIONATE MEMORY

OF

MORRIS JASTROW, JR.

The illustration on the title-page is of a Seal-Cylinder of the Goddess Ishtar, in the Rich collection, which was discussed by William Hayes Ward in his *Seal Cylinders of Western Asia*, p. 155

223.9011
5367

CONTENTS

FOREWORD 6

HOW THE SONG OF SONGS ENTERED THE CANON 9
Max L. Margolis

THE SONG OF SONGS IN EARLY AND MEDIAEVAL CHRISTIAN USE . . . 18
James A. Montgomery

GREEK ANALOGIES TO THE SONG OF SONGS 31
Walter Woodburn Hyde

THE HINDU SONG OF SONGS 43
Franklin Edgerton

THE SONG OF SONGS AND THE FERTILITY CULT 48
Theophile J. Meek

THE OFFERING-LISTS IN THE SONG AND THEIR POLITICAL SIGNIFICANCE . . 80
Wilfred H. Schoff

N12716

FOREWORD

The Oriental Club of Philadelphia, founded in 1888, has included in its proceedings researches by many scholars on a great variety of subjects, in part summarized in its Anniversary Volume entitled *Thirty Years of Oriental Studies*, Philadelphia, 1918 (Roland G. Kent, Editor).

Among publications by members of the Club have been three on the Song of Songs, by Paul Haupt, Morris Jastrow, Jr., and Theophile J. Meek. Interest in that fascinating book having been revived by recent discussion, a special meeting of the Club was held in Philadelphia, May 10, 1923, at which the papers now printed were read and discussed. It will be recognized that they present divergent views, on a subject as to which unanimity of opinion can hardly be expected. It was thought that in their very variety there might be reason for making them thus available to others.

The following were members of the Club at the date of the Symposium:

(in order of election to membership)

Cyrus Adler
Paul Haupt
George A. Barton
William N. Bates
James A. Montgomery
Solomon Solis-Cohen
Roland G. Kent
Max L. Margolis
William Romaine Newbold
Wilfred H. Schoff
Henry Malter
Franklin Edgerton
Walter W. Hyde
Isaac Husik
Edward Chiera
Royden Keith Yerkes
C. Theodore Benze
Elihu Grant
Langdon Warner
Rhys Carpenter
Harold H. Bender
Arthur L. Frothingham
Elbert Russell
Henry L. Crosby
David Magie
William K. Prentice
Joseph Cullen Ayer
David Werner Amram
Isaac G. Matthews
Henry S. Gehman
Frank G. Speck
Theophile J. Meek
Edward Capps
Dana C. Munro

Walter W. Hyde, *President*
Wilfred H. Schoff, *Secretary*

THE AUTHORS

MAX L. MARGOLIS is Professor of Biblical Philology in the Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, Philadelphia. He was Editor-in-chief in the preparation of the version of The Holy Scriptures for the Jewish Publication Society of America.

JAMES A. MONTGOMERY is Professor of Hebrew in the University of Pennsylvania, Professor of Old Testament Literature and Language in the Divinity School for the Protestant Episcopal Church in Philadelphia, and President of the American Schools of Oriental Research, Jerusalem and Bagdad.

WALTER WOODBURN HYDE is Assistant Professor of Greek in the University of Pennsylvania.

FRANKLIN EDGERTON is Assistant Professor of Sanskrit in the University of Pennsylvania.

THEOPHILE J. MEEK was, at the time of this Symposium, Professor of Semitic Languages and History of Religion in Bryn Mawr College. He has since accepted a call to the University of Toronto.

WILFRED H. SCHOFF is Secretary of The Commercial Museum, Philadelphia, and Associate Secretary of the American Schools of Oriental Research, Jerusalem and Bagdad.

HOW THE SONG OF SONGS ENTERED THE CANON

MAX L. MARGOLIS
Dropsie College

Renan remarked that to find the Song—and its companion as regards unfitness, Ecclesiastes—in the Canon is just as incongruous as to discover among the folio volumes of a theological library an Anacreon or Voltaire in duodecimo. But perhaps those are just the volumes one might look for in a theologian's collection of books. I wonder what odds and ends may not be found in the collections of all of us! Reuss poked fun at the theologues because in their exegesis of the Song they revealed their woeful ignorance of human anatomy. Since then the deficiency has been made good. On all hands the Song is looked upon as a loose collection of love-ditties, wedding-songs, erotic effluvia of the unchaste Oriental mind which calls a spade a spade. And then again scholars hold to a rigid notion of canonicity. Hence the dilemma. Now scientific questions may at any time be reopened. We have been fed up on a number of working hypotheses—some do not work at

all—to which we cling as if they were articles of faith never to be questioned. Let us then reopen the question of canonicity. I have done so in an unpretentious publication, *The Hebrew Scriptures in the Making*, 1922. Someone has referred to it as both unorthodox and uncritical. I am quite flattered, if by "uncritical" is meant receding from what passes as "critical", the theories of the school, repeated in commentaries and text-books and hardened into a tradition. Then a Catholic reviewer found fault with me because I did not hold apart "revelation" and "inspiration". I did not mean to, because I based myself squarely upon the data in the Scriptures themselves. Now, on page 86 of my little book, I said that "the term Canon is Christian, the word Semitic, the thing itself Jewish". The Jews have a variety of expressions for "canonical" and the counterpart "apocryphal". They use circumlocution. The Holy Scriptures are treble, and not quadruple. A fourth part therefore is known to exist, but it is without. The tripartition is not wanting in the English Bible, only the order, ascending to the Greek Bible, is Historical Books, Wisdom Books, Prophets; and so do the Prophets come last in the Jewish New Year's Liturgy. Then the writings on the outside are the excess, of

which one is to beware, lest in admitting them we bring in confusion (*mehimah*, play on the word *mehemmah*, "more than these", Eccles. 12: 12). The Scriptures are objects of painstaking study, while the others may be read casually, as one reads a letter. Observe that in the synagogue the scroll of Esther is spread out on reading like a letter; I know it is called a letter in 9: 26, 29, at the same time there may be a lingering notion of its doubtful canonicity. The uncanonical books were written "from that time onwards". The time is when the Holy Spirit was withdrawn from Israel. The cessation of prophecy is placed by the doctors in the period of the Great Synagogue, of which body Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi were members. The high priest Simon the Just is accounted one of the last of that organization. It is a mooted question whether the first or the second Simon is meant. The rabbis have peculiar chronological notions concerning the duration of the Persian period. Prophecy, of course, did not cease all at once; it flagged, and at length stopped altogether. The Maccabean age knew itself as prophetless (Ps. 74: 9). There results a definition of the Scriptures as not merely recording the words and deeds of inspired men, but as written down under inspiration by an

unbroken line of authors. These books "defile the hands", while the others do not. These are read in public, the others, a sort of near-Scripture, may be read in private, at the home, outside the synagogue in which the canonical Scriptures are physically enshrined and which as an institution was founded primarily for their reading and exposition. There is still a fifth class, books which may not be read even privately: he who reads them excommunicates himself. These are counterfeit Scriptures, the Pseudepigrapha.

The fourth class, comprising the near-Scriptural writings, hovered on the borderland. When a rabbi forgets himself, he includes Ben Sira in the third part, the nondescript Writings. It is possible, of course, that citing from memory, he may have thought that he was quoting Proverbs. But the copy found in the Cairo Genizah—it had been removed into the store room since according to strict norm it did not belong in the synagogue proper—contains marginal variants, and in one case the reader—of course, the public reader—is bidden to substitute a reading for that of the text, exactly as is the fashion with our canonical texts. It seems that Ben Sira and the others of the near-Scriptural class were definitely thrust out "in

that day" when the scholars met at Jamnia about 90 A. D. As they discussed the merits of these writings, someone brought up the question why some books in the Canon, concerning which the rigorists felt uneasy, were permitted to remain. Akiba denies that the Song, which he considered the holiest of the Writings, was challenged. The same scholar was annoyed by the profanation of the Song which merry-making youth was wont to recite at banquets. But it is recorded that the school of Shammai excluded Ecclesiastes from the canon. Nevertheless we may safely assume that both writings had really formed part of the canon for some time, and though uneasiness might be felt it was silenced. They had been there, and could not be dislodged.

But how did the Song get into the Canon? Now whatever we may know about the closing of the Canon, it takes our text-books hundreds of pages to say how little we know when the process of canonization began. If we operate with the thesis of Reuss, elaborated by Graf and popularized by Wellhausen, we shall tell our students that the cell of the Scriptural canon is the code promulgated 621 B. C., which was not found at all because it had never been lost, in fact had not been written until a day or so before

it was produced. Around it grew the other parts of the Pentateuch; either the whole of it or the Priests' Code was in solemn assembly sworn to in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah. Then at a time to be determined by conjecture the prophetical writings which had antedated the compilation of the Pentateuch were assembled and given second canonical rank; Daniel, a prophetical book, was left out because at the time of the closing it had not been written; lastly the Writings were gathered together and given third canonical rank. Thus the moderns place themselves squarely upon the traditional tripartition of the Scriptures and upon the late Jewish notions of canonicity. To my mind, however, and I am employing my critical faculties however insignificant, the notion of canonicity had a history itself, it came to be and had not always been the same. So far I accept the traditional idea that canonicity connotes inspiration. But what were the workings of the Spirit in ancient Israel? The Scriptures supply the answer. At all times the people commanded a triple source of revelation. They might consult the priest as between clean and unclean or between the vow that must be kept and the vow which might be broken; they sought the word of God at the mouth of the prophet;

and they asked counsel of the wise men and wise women. The wise spoke in "mashals"; an offshoot of the "mashal" was the song—the singer was inspired, "the spirit of God spoke by him, and His word was upon his tongue". A torah taught, a prophetic word spoken, a song sung, each of the three genres was considered the work of inspiration. All these three categories were committed to writing so soon as writing was the vogue, and we may take it that torah teachers, prophets, and wise singers vied with each other in codifying their lore. The three parts of the Canon originated simultaneously and each grew to its present dimensions by a long evolution which consisted in some being thrown out and some retained and honored, honored in accordance with the prevailing mood of the people which itself underwent great modifications. The three strains, furthermore, reacted each upon the others. There were conflicts between priests who favored centralization and imageless worship and those who did not; between the priests and the prophets; between prophets and prophets; between the strictly religious, whether priests or prophets, and the more secular "mashal" poets. Each camp had its canon, its own standard of classicity. Israel must not be

invested with the standards of late or early Judaism. The canon in its beginnings, *i. e.* in Israel, was more elastic, secularism had not yet been submerged, Israel sang and had her joys like other nations, and in Israel as elsewhere the song was hallowed. And so the Song of Songs must be taken to have been admitted into the Canon at an early date, when the later and more rigorous notions had not yet obtained.

Thus by divesting canonicity of its late Jewish implications we may answer the question before us. But if you are not minded to follow me, then the only alternative that remains is to de-secularize the Song. This has been done by Professor Meek, and I must admit that I am quite captivated by his study. Perhaps the two views may be combined. The beginnings of the Canon will thus be seen to ascend to the popular religion unrefined by prophetism, uncurbed by legalism, in reality to the Canaanite religion itself. The ultimate circumscription of the Canon was conditioned by prophecy before legalism stepped in. The prophetic, and not the legal, element dominates our Hebrew Scriptures even in the traditional compass. See my publication referred to. But neither prophet nor priest nor scribe could subdue that which "is strong as death, cruel as

the grave, the very flame of the Lord". When the late Jewish theory of the standard of canonicity proved futile, its face was saved by allegorical interpretation, by treating the Song as a "mashal" of divine love which, as Professor Meek tells us, it was from the beginning—in my own language, when it was first admitted into the Canon whose beginnings must be sought in early Israel and the still earlier Canaanite religion.

II

THE SONG OF SONGS IN EARLY AND MEDIAEVAL CHRISTIAN USE

JAMES A. MONTGOMERY
University of Pennsylvania

Of the two outstanding Jewish writers in the age of the New Testament, Philo, prince of allegorists, makes absolutely no mention of the Song; but Josephus includes it among the four books which he calls "hymns to God and instructions of life for men" (*c. Ap.* i. 8), and he may be presumed to have known of its mystical interpretation. The only possible mystical treatment of the Song in the Septuagint is in the translation of *merosh amana*, 4: 8, by "from the beginning of faith".

In the New Testament there is no citation of or allusion to the Song, and as there is no Rabbinical reference to it earlier than the so-called councils of Jamnia at the end of the century, it would appear that the religious significance of the Song did not become dominant until after the compilation of the Christian Testament.

However there are traces in the New Testament of a mysticism parallel to the Jewish

interpretation of the Song as depicting the relation of the Church to the Messiah. In the Gospels the Messiah is the Bridegroom, Mk. 2: 19f, Jn. 3: 29, and there are the parables of the Marriage, Mt. 22: 25. The same allegory is used by St. Paul, 2 Cor. 11: 2: "I espoused you to one husband that I might present you as a pure virgin to Christ," and in particular is to be noticed his extended treatment of the duties of wives and husbands, Eph. 5: 22-23, culminating in the citation of Gen. 2: 24: "For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother and shall cleave to his wife, and the twain shall become one flesh," to which the Apostle adds the allegorizing statement: "This mystery is great, but I speak in regard of Christ and His Church." The same theme appears in the Christian Apocalypse in the symbols of the Marriage of the Lamb and of the Bride the Wife of the Lamb who is adorned as a wife for her husband, Rev. 19:7; 21:2,9. Similarly Zion appears as Wife in the contemporary Jewish apocalypse 2 Esdras, 9:38; 10:25ff. The precedent for these figures is abundantly found in Second Isaiah and the Book of Baruch.

Zimmern (*Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, 394) compares with this symbolism the marriage feast of Marduk and Sarpanitu, and

recalls the Gnostic marriage of the Saviour and Wisdom. But there are Old Testament motives at hand in the marriage relation between Israel and Yahweh, (cf. Hosea, e. g. c. 2, Jer. e. g. 2: 1ff), and in the epithalamium of Ps. 45, early interpreted as Messianic. And back of the Hebrew religion stretches a long ancestry of Semitic sensual mysticism bearing upon the relation of god and people. Also of kindred import, in idealistic thought, is the passion for Wisdom as expressed in the Book of Wisdom, 8: 2: "Her I loved and sought out from my youth, and I sought to take her for my bride, and I became enamored of her beauty," with which we spontaneously compare the argument of Plato's Symposium. As the Wisdom of God came to be identified by Christian theology with Christ (1 Cor. 1: 24), that theme could have lent itself to the mysticism of the Church.

There is no known allegorical use of the Song in the Christian Church until the first half of the third century. There is one production of that age which is charged with amatory symbolism of the relation of the soul to the Lord, namely the Syriac Odes of Solomon, discovered by Rendel Harris and published by him in 1909. Doubtless its name is due to its likeness in symbolic content to the canonical

Song. But it appears to be an almost entirely independent product of mystical exaltation. We may note an example, from Ode 3: "I love the Beloved and my soul loves him, and where his rest is there also am I." The editor and the commentators have however found no allusion to the Song. But I have noticed one literary link. Ode 19 speaks of "the breasts of the Father", which are "full" and "given to the world", etc. This motive, hitherto unexplained, is, I believe, dependent upon a mistranslation of the Septuagint, which misread *dodim*, "love", in 1: 2, as *daddaim*, "breasts", so that we read in the Greek in an address to the lover, "Goodly are thy breasts above wine", where the Hebrew has, "Goodly is thy love above wine". This may be only a distant literary reminiscence, and we note that the mystic sentiment of the Odes is independent of the Song.

The first allegorical treatment of the Song in the Church is the commentary thereupon by Hippolytus of Rome, written early in the third century. Apart from some fragments this work first became known to the modern world through extensive Slavic sections published by Bonwetsch in 1897 in the Berlin corpus of the Greek Fathers, and so it is earlier than Origen's commentary to which the commentators generally

assign first place in Christian exegesis. Hippolytus follows the Jewish exegesis, exemplified to the full in the Midrash in interpreting the amatory sentiment as between Christ and the Church; the passion of the individual soul is not particularly stressed, although in the opening sentences, after expounding the "King" as of Christ, he expounds the "bedchamber" as of the Church, and so implicitly the soul is the Bride. But this implication is not further insisted upon. The relation of this commentary to the Midrash deserves further study, for the Christian treatment doubtless drew directly from Rabbinism.

Origen, the somewhat younger contemporary of Hippolytus, and a resident in Palestine, is the classic Christian commentator on the Song, having left a commentary in five books. In this he follows both interpretations, of the Church and of the Soul as the Bride, and so may be regarded as the protagonist of the individualistic treatment of the Song which was to become so prominent in subsequent ages. The effect of his commentary on his own and after ages is expressed in the comment of the comparatively dispassionate Jerome that "as he surpassed all in his other books, so in this he surpassed himself." And Westcott remarks, in his study of

Origen in the *Dict. of Christian Biography* that "no work of Origen's more widely influenced later commentators." With the exception of Theodore of Mopsuestia and others of the Antiochene School (this became one of the charges of heresy against Theodore), the allegorical treatment of the Song carried all before it.

Before descending to the Middle Ages we have to note another current that had its roots at least in part in the Orient and came to be diffused through East and West by the magic spirit of the so-called Dionysius the Areopagite. One of the currents that fed this stream is connected with the name of a certain Hierotheos, to whom is attributed a collection of "Erotic Hymns". This Hierotheos is probably to be identified with a Syrian monk of the latter part of the fifth century, Stephen bar Sudaili. The sources of information on Bar Sudaili have been conveniently collected by our fellowmember in the Club, Dr. A. L. Frothingham, in his work, *Stephen bar Sudaili, the Syrian Mystic, and the Book of Hierotheos* (Leyden, 1886). Frothingham gives a summary of the Syriac Book of Hierotheos, but this is all we have in print bearing upon that interesting name. The discovery of the "Erotic Hymns", by some good chance, might possibly reveal a composition of lineal

relation to the Odes of Solomon and the Hymn of the Soul. In regard to Hierotheos it is disputed whether he is a source of the Pseudo-Dionysius or a reflection of that movement. Frothingham shows good reason for the originality of Hierotheos, but Duval in his *Littérature syriaque*, pp. 358ff, opposes Frothingham's view. At all events we must allow room in the Syriac field for an original current of mystical thought clothing itself in sensuous expression, not necessarily dependent upon Neo-Platonic or Pseudo-Dionysian influences, which themselves indeed drew largely from the Orient.*

This Oriental source of mystical and erotic ecstasy contributed to the thought and expression of two religions, Islam and Christianity. In the "Middle Ages" of both appeared a remarkable outburst of passionate devotion of the soul to God, which in its abandonment could only express itself in the terms of man's intensest passion, that of sexual love. For the Islamic development in Sufism I must refer to R. A. Nicholson's delightful volume *Studies in Islamic*

* I have not been able to see A. Merx, *Ideen u. Grundlinien einer allgem. Gesch. d. Mystik*, Heidelberg, 1893, which Baumstark adduces for Bar Sudaili; nor G. R. S. Mead, *Quests New and Old*, with a chapter on *Hierotheos*. [The reader is referred also to C. E. Rolt's excellent introduction to his edition of Dionysius the Areopagite, S. P. C. K., London 1920.—Ed.]

Mysticism. Indeed the lover and the Sufi were psychologically not far apart; it is difficult at times to determine how far a poem is primarily sensuous, how far mystically spiritual. There are cases where the troubadour of younger years later dons the Sufi's cloak; such an example is given by A. V. Williams Jackson in his charming volume on *Early Persian Poetry*, p. 46.

This wave of mysticism equally overflowed the West and found its noblest expression in Bernard of Clairvaux. In the Song of Songs, on which he composed eighty-six homilies, he found the treasury of his pictures and the vocabulary of his language. Of him says Henry Osborn Taylor in *The Mediaeval Mind*, i, 428: "With surprising spirituality Bernard uses the texts of Canticles to set forth the love of the soul to Christ, of man to God. The texts are what they are, burning, sensuous, fleshly, intense and beautiful—every one knows them; but in Bernard's sermons flesh fades before the spirit's whiter glow." Possibly then in this spiritual commentator we find the best apology for the presence of the Song in Sacred Scripture.

But this spiritual treatment of noble chastity degraded into the erotic hallucinations of many nuns of the age; see Taylor, i, chap. 20. A series of monastic women carried their yearnings for

the divine Lover to the extreme of sensuous expression. Mary of Orguies, Liutgard of Tongern, Mechthild of Magdeburg, are examples of the morbid pathology of unsatisfied sex. All the erotic desire of the unwedded bride for her lover is uttered in the sensuous terms of the flesh as the only adequate expression of the spiritual passion for the Lord. And the Song of Songs dictated the language of these poor virgins.

My colleagues at the University of Pennsylvania, Prof. Jean Beck and Mr. George F. Cole, have kindly called my attention to some most interesting side-lights on the use of the Song in the Middle Ages, which probably are unknown to the theological treatments of the age. It may be useful therefore to notice here two poems of rare beauty which reflect the influence of the Biblical book. One is an Early-French poem known from its first line as "Quant li solleiz converset en Leon" ("When the sun stays in Leo"), the most recent study of which by J. Acher in the *Zeitschrift f. französische Sprache u. Litteratur*, vol. 38, pp. 47-94, Dr. Beck placed in my hands. As the writer shows, the poem is written in honor of the Virgin for the Feast of the Assumption, August 15, and in it the Holy Mother takes the place of the Church and

is represented as the Beloved seeking for the Lover, at once her Son and Bridegroom. Citation of a few stanzas will reveal the reminiscences of the Song:

Une pulcellet odi molt gent plorer
Et son ami dolcement regreter,
Co jo lli dis:

"Gentilz pucellet, molt t'ai odit plorer
Et tum ami dolcement regreter,
Et chi est illi?"

. . . .

Li tensz est bels, les vinnesz sont floriës,
L'odor est bonet, si l'aimat molt mi siret
Por mei' amor.

. . . .

Beles pulcelesz, fillesz Jerusalem,
Por mei amor noncieiz le mon amant,
D'amor languis.

Just as in the Orient so also in the Western Church there appears to have been a very close relation between sacred and secular poesy. According to Dr. Beck's view (*La musique des Troubadours*, Paris) the wonderful poetry of the Troubadours had its first incentives from the Church. And here our Song, so long used in hymn and homily of the Church, inspired those unsurpassed poets of love. In a manuscript volume at Vienna, containing all kinds of religious poems and also secular songs, appears a Latin poem of the twelfth century, an autograph

copy of which Dr. Beck has kindly lent me. Is it rather spiritual, or is it secular? At all events it cites in the last lines almost literally from the Song 2: 12 (cited above in the hymn to the Virgin), while other reminiscences are obvious. I cannot refrain from giving this gem at length.

Jam dulcis amica venito
Quam sicut cor meum diligo
Intra in cubiculum meum
Ornamentis cunctis onustum

Ibi sunt sedilia strata
Et domus velis ornata
Floresque in domo sparguntur
Herbesque flagrantes miscentur

Est ibi mensa apposita
Universis cibis onusta
Ibi clarum vinum abundat
Et quidquid te cara delectat

Ibi sonant dulces symphonie
Inflantur et altius tybie
Ibi puer doctus et puella
Pangunt tibi carmina bella

Hic cum plectro cytharam tangit
Illa melos cum lyra pangit
Portantque ministri pateras
Dignitatis poculis plenas

Non me juvat tantum convivium
Quantum post dulce colloquium
Nec rerum tantarum uberitas
Ut dilecta familiaritas

Jam nunc veni soror electa
Et prae cunctis michi dilecta
Lux meae clare pupille
Parsque maior animae meae

Ego fui sola in silva
Et dilexi loca secreta
Frequenter effugi tumultum
Et vitavi populum multum

Carissima noli tardare
Studeamus nos nunc amare
Sine te non potere vivere
Iam decet amorem perficere

Quid iuvat differre electa
. . . . . .
Certa quod eris factura
In me non est aliqua mora

Jam nix glaciesque liquescit
Folium et herba virescit
Philomela iam contat in alto
Ardet amor cordis in antro

The above study indicates that the Song has by no means been the cause and origin of this mystic and often erotic expression of spiritual longings and relations. That spiritual passion is germane to every religion of mystical character and found its voice within the Church without regard to the canonical book. Only the Song became an authoritative thesaurus of word and thought for the mystic's vocabulary, and its lot

in the Canon has approved itself to those souls who have so known to use it.

Post scriptum. I have happened upon some graceful Coptic stanzas in paraphrase of the Song, which well illustrate the Christian use of the Biblical book in the Middle Ages. They are found in an article by Junker, entitled "Koptische Poesie des 10 Jahrhunderts," in *Oriens Christianus* (Rome) vii, 1907; the stanzas in question appear pp. 345ff.

(*The Beloved*) Ein Büschlein echter Myrrhe
Ist in mitten meiner Brust
Und ein Cypressenzweig,
Spricht die Königin, die Kirche.

Das ist die Stimme meines Brüders,
Die kommt und über unsere Berge eilt,
Sie kommt über die Hügel,
Spricht die Königin, die Kirche.

(*The Lover*) Meine Braut, meine Taube,
Meine wahre, vollkommene Kirche,
Auf, folge mir nach,
Dass ich dich in den Himmel zu meinem Vater führe.

Komm zu mir von Libanon,
Meine Braut, meine schöne Taube,
Meine wahre Kirche,
Du Ort der Sündenvergebung für alle Menschen.

III

GREEK ANALOGIES TO THE SONG OF SONGS

WALTER WOODBURN HYDE
University of Pennsylvania

In seeking analogies to the Song of Songs in Greek literature, I felt compelled at the outset to define my conclusions as to the artistic structure and purpose of this unique book of the Hebrew Scriptures.

It was easy to eliminate the traditional allegorical interpretation which has exercised commentators since the time of Rabbi Akiba in the first half of the second century A. D., and of Origen in the first half of the third. The latter regarded the poem as a description of a spiritual and not an earthly love, the bridegroom being Christ and the bride the Church or the believing soul. Later defenders of this view have frequently pointed out analogies to the poem in the pantheistic mysticism of Islam, in the poetry of Hafiz and the songs of modern dervishes. But every attempt to allegorize the Song of Songs only tends to destroy its artistic unity and natural sequence of thought. It is far more logical to take its language literally, even as did

the youth in antiquity who sang it in the wine-shops.

Among literal interpretations there are equal difficulties in regarding the poem as a drama, whether sacred or secular, the prevailing view in the 18th and 19th centuries, given general recognition in the 19th by the authority of Ewald, and more recently accepted by Robertson Smith, Delitzsch, Driver, Harper, and others. The poem certainly contains dramatic elements, dialogue and monologue, but it has no plot, and none of the dramatic schemes offered agrees as to how it should be divided, who the speakers are, or where the action takes place. Such an interpretation necessitates whole scenes being taken as dreams, and as a drama supposes a freedom of intercourse between lovers quite unknown in the East. That such short scenes never could have been acted upon a stage has been accepted by the more recent defenders of the view. If the Song of Songs is a drama, it is unique, for it has no analogy in Greek or any other literature.

I think more can be said for the well-known view that it is an epithalamium, at least in the later developments of the theory that it is a collection of wedding songs. Thus at the outset it differs from such ancient epithalamia as the

18th Idyl of Theocritus or the 61st poem of Catullus. This theory, resting on the allegorical interpretation of Origen who applied it to the marriage of Solomon and the daughter of Pharaoh, and accepted in antiquity by Eusebius and Polychronius, was revived in France at the close of the 17th century by Bossuet, who believed that the various parts of the Song of Songs were sung on the seven days of a wedding week. More recently Renan suggested that the poem was merely an ancient libretto for such occasions, explaining it as midway between regular drama and pastoral dialogue. Such theories received apparent confirmation from anthropological data collected in 1873 by Wetzstein from the observation of wedding customs among Syrian peasants, where for seven days after the ceremony the groom and bride are revered as king and queen by the villagers, who sing and dance and celebrate sports before them as they sit upon a threshing-board erected as a throne on the green threshing-floor. As you know, Budde, in his commentary of 1898, applied these customs to the interpretation of the poem which he believed was a collection of wedding songs made by an old poet to describe a wedding at which groom and bride were not only compared with king and queen, but with

Solomon and his Shulamite love—the threshing-floor representing the palanquin of Solomon, the shepherds his guard, the bridesmaids the daughters of Jerusalem, the songs and dances descriptive of the apparel of the happy pair. Moreover, he believed the Hebrew poem referred to wedded love, interpreting the pictures of scenery as covert allusions to the sex instinct within the bonds of matrimony. Thus, the wine was sexual intercourse, the grapes the breasts of the fair one, the lilies her lips, the feeding of the flock among lilies osculation, the vineyard the bride's body, etc. But the order of the songs is against such an interpretation, even if it be assumed that wedding songs form the nucleus of the poem, and there is little evidence that wedded love is described. Furthermore, finding in every description of natural scenery allusions to sex is merely following once more the discarded allegorical method.

It seems to me more logical to regard the Song of Songs as a collection of love lyrics having their origin in the experience and imagination of the poet who expresses them with such striking imagery and charm, and again with such realistic frankness. The purpose of the Song, it seems to me, can hardly be to teach any institution, such as the blessedness of wedded

love, thus resting its canonicity on the moral picture which it presents. It seems rather merely to express in poetic language the love of man and woman, setting forth the joy and vigor of the great passion of human life. The simplicity of the poem, its frank sensuousness and lack of reflection, only remove its descriptions to a more primitive expression of love than the one we know and praise. The suggestion, however ingeniously worked out, that it served any higher didactic or religious purpose, that it was divinely intended to show the desirability of lawful union, that it was a ritual of a Love Deity, rather than a collection of country love songs, appears to me to be merely the result of the attempt to explain its presence in the canon of the Old Testament.

The history of the literal interpretation of the Song of Songs begins with Theodore of Mopsuestia who died in 429 A. D., and who was condemned over a century later in 553 A. D. by the Second Council of Constantinople for having interpreted it as a poem composed by Solomon in answer to the popular complaint against his Egyptian marriage. Literal interpretations began in modern times with Chateillon in 1544, who proposed to expel the poem from the canon on immoral grounds. Ten years

later Peter Nannius suggested that it was a collection of eclogues, and in 1559 the Spaniard Luis de Leon regarded the poem as entirely a pastoral. Hugo Grotius, in 1644, was the first to look upon it as an *oaristys* or "Lovers' Discourse" held by Solomon and Pharaoh's daughter, and remarked its great resemblance to the 27th Idyl of Theocritus in which a realistic dialogue is portrayed between the swain Daphnis and his beloved Acrotime. Again, in 1662 and 1663, Charles Cotin declared that parts of the Song of Songs were composed in the form of madrigals. In 1685 Jean le Clerc declared it was composed of "idyls more dithyrambic than the eclogues of the Greeks and Romans". In 1707 Charles Claude Genest, in his dissertation on idyls and eclogues, concluded that the author had copied the style of Theocritus. In 1777 Johann Lessing, the brother of the more famous Gottlieb, published the poem as a collection of eclogues. His contemporary Herder, in his *Solomon's Lieder der Liebe*, 1778, explained it as a collection of detached songs without inner unity culminating in the description of the joys of conjugal love, a theory once hesitatingly held by Goethe, and since worked out with

modifications by many scholars, notably by Edouard Reuss in his *Le Cantique des Cantiques*, 1879.

H. Graetz, in his *Schir-ha-Schirim oder das Salomonische Hohelied*, 1871, and Russell Martineau in an essay in the *A. J. P.* of 1892, have carefully discussed the similarities between the Song of Songs and the Idyls of Theocritus. Resemblances in form, however, are hardly to be found in the 18th Idyl—*The Epithalamium of Helen*—but in the 27th already mentioned. The former is a short epic piece whose theme, as the scholiast tells us, was borrowed from the Sicilian poet's fifth century predecessor Stesichorus. It recounts how once on a time at the palace of yellow-haired Menelaus in Sparta twelve noble maidens came to the bridal chamber crowned with garlands to serenade the son of Atreus and the girl of his choice after he had closed the door. There they sang till the palace rang. The poem begins (translation of J. M. Edmonds in the Loeb Library, 1919):

What Bridegroom! dear Bridegroom! thus early abed and asleep?
Wast born a man of sluggardye,
Or is thy pillow sweet to thee,
Or ere thou cam'st to bed maybe
Didst drink a little deep?

If thou wert so fain to sleep betimes, 'twere better sleep alone,
And leave a maid with maids to play
By a fond mother's side till dawn of day,
Sith for the morrow and its morn,
For this and all the years unborn,
This sweet bride is thine own.

and ends:

Sleep on and rest, and on either breast may the love-breath playing go;
Sleep now, but when the day shall break
Forget not from your sleep to wake;
For we shall come wi' the dawn along
Soon as the first-waked master o' song
Lift feathery neck to crow.

Sing Hey for the Wedding, sing Ho for the Wedder,
And thanks to him that made it!

This is hardly the spirit of the Song of Songs. That spirit of a franker avowal of the delights of love is seen far better in the realistic 27th Idyll, where the speakers Daphnis and Acrotime correspond with the Shepherd and the Shulamite. The Greek poem is similarly surcharged with the frank description of sensuous love.

Nathaniel Schmidt, in his *Messages of the Poets*, 1911, has pointed out that one is struck even more by resemblances between the Hebrew poem and those of the Greek amatory poets Meleager and Philodemus, who lived in the first century B. C. Both were born at Gadara in Palestine, and spent their youth east of the Jordan. The younger, Philodemus, an Epicurean

philosopher, was accused by Cicero for aiding Piso in his profligacy, although in this and another passage the orator speaks of him as living on terms of intimacy at Rome with men of the highest rank and learning, and as a poet of great skill. Thirty-four of his poems have survived in the Greek Anthology, 13 of which appear among the *Amatory Epigrams* of the fifth book, and many of them show resemblance in tone to the Hebrew poem. Meleager is better known to us as the author of a collection of his own and other poems called the *Stephanos* or *Wreath*, which later formed the nucleus of the *Palatine Anthology*. We have 131 of his poems, 81 of which appear in the erotic collection of the fifth book. Both poets are licentious in theme, though elegant in form. It was the scenery of the Decapolis which nurtured their appreciation of natural beauty and fondness for describing love as affected by nature's moods. It was here that they wove their charming lyrics into garlands. It is possible, as Schmidt has said, that Meleager may have had predecessors in this *genre* of poetry, unknown Greek singers who already had gathered love lyrics in this part of Palestine, and who may have influenced the author of the Song of Songs. In one of Meleager's poems we find a reference to a Jew who is favored by a

Greek mistress, a poem which is typical of the rest (Greek Anthology: v. 160 transl. by W. R. Paton in Loeb Library, 1916):—

> "White-cheeked Demo, some one hath thee naked next him and is taking his delight, but my own heart groans within me. If thy lover is some Sabbath-keeper, no great wonder! Love burns hot even on cold Sabbaths."

I imagine it was such an anthology, composed on Greek lines and during the Greek period, which the author of the Song of Songs produced. Such a *florilegium* does not mean, as Herder, Diestel, Reuss, and more recently Cheyne, have thought, that the songs were detached without inner unity. Even if the songs, as we have them, show indubitable signs of rewriting, expansions and transpositions, perhaps as a political document, and though some of them belong to the folklore of more than one century, the style and form of the completed poem seem to me to show such unity of design that we can assume that the bulk of it was the work of a single poet. That the author was influenced by Greek poetry and customs is clear. The spirit and atmosphere of the song is un-Hebraic, even if its peculiar imagery has its parallel in such books as Hosea, certain chapters of Ezekiel, and, above all, the 45th Psalm. Its tone is Greek and the poetic type first appears in Theocritus, who, as we

know, had his Greek and Roman imitators and may have had a Hebrew one. Many have pointed out the author's use of Greek words:—*pardes* (*paradeisos*) (4, 13), *appiryon* (*phoreion*) (3: 9), *mazer*, mixture (*krama*) (7: 2), *kopher*, henna (*kupros*) (1: 14); and the use of Theocritean comparisons, as where both poets liken the beloved to a steed, and both refer to the maiden's breasts in the lover's embrace. And where Greek words and figures of speech occur we should also expect Greek customs and habits of life: thus the lover's lips in the Song of Songs are likened to "pillars of marble" (5: 15)—a phrase only occurring in other late books of the Bible, as in I Chron. (29: 2) and Esther (1: 6); the allusion to "watchmen that go about in the city" (3; 3), must refer to the system of city-police inaugurated in Macedonian times; the rich palanquin or chariot of Solomon (3: 9-10), described as made of wood of Lebanon, its pillars of silver, its bottom of gold, and its seat of purple, is unique in the Old Testament, but has its counterparts amid the luxury of the later Greeks and the Romans. As Graetz has said; "the writer knew the Greek language, the Greek literature and art, the Greeks' manners and vices". Reminiscences of the poetry of Theocritus in the Song of Songs

make it possible, then, to believe, as did Genest in 1707, that the author had read the Sicilian poet, rather than, as J. T. Lessing believed in 1777, that the Greek poet, during his sojourn in Alexandria around 270 B. C., had read a Greek version of the Hebrew poem. References to objects in Heshbon, Rabbath Ammon and Damascus (7), seem to indicate that the Hebrew poet did not live in Alexandria, as so many scholars have thought, but in Palestine, somewhere in the Decapolis south of Damascus, as is also shown by the striking similarity between his poem and those of the Greek Meleager and Philodemus, who so feelingly describe the beauties of that lovely region.

IV

THE HINDU SONG OF SONGS

FRANKLIN EDGERTON
University of Pennsylvania

Some of the problems which have puzzled scholars concerning the Biblical Song of Songs are paralleled in the Hindu Song of Songs—the Gita Govinda, or in full Gita-govinda-kavyam, "Poem in which Govinda (Krishna) is celebrated in songs", composed in Sanskrit by the poet Jayadeva of Bengal in the twelfth century of our era. Despite its lateness, it ranks justly as one of the gems of Sanskrit literature. The exquisite beauty of its language, the marvelous harmony of its great variety of meters, the fervid passion which is so frankly and eloquently expressed in its lines, all combine to make it, indeed, one of the world's greatest love-poems. It is, however, not only a love-poem. Its author unquestionably felt it also as a religious poem, in honor of his god, Krishna. And furthermore attempts have often been made, both in India and in the west, to see in it religious or philosophical allegories, which are not plainly expressed by the poet, and which it is very doubtful whether he had in mind at all. It is especially

these things, of course, that have suggested the comparison with the Biblical Song of Songs.

Unlike the Biblical book, the Gita Govinda presents no problems whatever as to its superficial or exoteric meaning. It is a series of dialogs in twelve cantos. The characters are three in all: the god Krishna, his favorite mistress Radha, and a female attendant of Radha's. Into the mouths of each in turn are put the various songs, composed in very intricate and artistic, even artificial, meters. These dialog-songs are joined together by narrative verses, in which the poet speaks in his own person. There are also in each of the twelve cantos verses of blessing or of prayer to Krishna, in which Jayadeva names himself and declares himself a pious worshiper of the god. The speakers of all the songs, as well as their respective meters and melodies, are named in the poem itself, so that there are no problems as to the dramatic situation at any point of the poem.

It will be seen that the Gita Govinda is not a drama, but a sort of lyric ballad. It tells the story of the reunion of Krishna and Radha, after they had been separated because of Krishna's infidelity with the *gopis* or cowherd-maidens. In the opening Radha's attendant describes to her how Krishna is sporting and

dancing with the *gopis*. Radha withdraws to a bower in sorrowful jealousy, singing to her attendant a song in which Krishna is reproacht, but at the same time love and longing for him are exprest. Presently Krishna tires of the *gopis* and his thoughts turn back to the deserted Radha. He sings of his remorse and his love for Radha. The friend of Radha comes to him and describes Radha's sorrow and her love. With the aid of the friend the lovers are finally reunited, after some reproachful coyness on the part of Radha.

The verses at the end of each canto, in which Jayadeva pays homage to the god Krishna, make it indubitable that he intended his poem at least partly as a work of religious devotion. He desired to please the god by describing this incident in the god's human career. In that sense the poem is, then, unquestionably religious as well as erotic. The combination need not surprise one who knows the Hindu attitude towards sex, which is more frank and, one is tempted to say, natural than ours.

Much more dubious are the attempts which have been made to interpret the eroticism of the poem not in a literal but in an allegoric sense, exactly as in the case of the Biblical Song of Songs. Both in India and in the West the

theory has been advanst that Krishna and Radha represent the human soul and God, or final salvation. The assignment of the parts in this allegorical drama seems somewhat uncertain. As Jayadeva tells us himself that he was a worshiper of Krishna, it would seem that the part of God should be taken by the Krishna of the poem, if by any character in it—which would leave the part of the human soul to Radha. But this fits very ill the plot of the poem. It is Krishna who strays from the straight and narrow path, and it is Krishna who does the seeking; Radha is not the seeker but the sought. Accordingly the usual interpretation of the allegorical school makes Krishna represent the human soul. The *gopis* are worldly allurements who seduce the soul away from his true mistress, Salvation, or the divine grace, represented by Radha—who however never forgets the sinning and wandering soul, and forgives him when he awakens to his true needs and his higher destiny.

Whatever may be the case with its Biblical parallel, I have the impression that most Sanskritists of the present day are not inclined to accept this allegorical interpretation of Jayadeva's Song of Songs. To me, at any rate, it seems that the eroticism of the poem is genuine eroticism. There is no more allegory in the story

of Radha and Krishna than in many other legendary adventures of Krishna and of other incarnations of Vishnu. It is an act of devotion, to the Hindu feeling, to describe any such legendary adventures of divine heroes. Some of them seem to us rather unedifying, and difficult to reconcile with the orthodox Hindu belief that these heroes were incarnations of the supreme deity. But if we were to feel it necessary on that ground to explain as allegories all the reported adventures of Krishna and Rama, for instance, which do not suit our ideals of divinity, we should have other problems than this on our hands. The story of Krishna and Radha, while certainly not one of the oldest parts of the Krishna cycle of legends, was with equal certainty not invented by Jayadeva, but familiarly known long before his time. He simply chose this as one of the sacred stories about his god, and composed a poem on this theme as an earnest of his religious devotion. No allegorical explanation is at all necessary.

V

THE SONG OF SONGS AND THE FERTILITY CULT

THEOPHILE JAMES MEEK
The University of Toronto

In an article recently published, "Canticles and the Tammuz Cult",[1] I attempted to show that our present book of Canticles had its origin in the early fertility cult which the Hebrews took over from the agricultural Canaanites on their settlement in Canaan. The Old Testament is full of references to this cult. The prophets, especially Hosea and Jeremiah, were particularly severe in their condemnation of it and many people with their growing sense of morality must have looked askance upon its licentious practices, but despite all it continued down to late times.[2] Institutions die hard. Indeed they rarely die at all, but are rather reinterpreted to suit new ideas and new situations. Man makes progress so laboriously that what he once attains he tends to cling to for the rest of time. It is not surprising, therefore, to find the Hebrews engaged in fertility rites long after their

[1] *AJSL*, XXXIX, 1-14.

[2] See *AJSL*, XXXIX, 3. For another reference to the Tammuz cult in the late period see Joel 1: 8 ff. (a reference to the ceremonial wailing over the death of vegetation).

original significance had been forgotten and it is quite to be expected that fragments of the original liturgies should have survived. Some of these are unquestionably to be found in Canticles.[3]

Easter is of course the great festival that survives even down to our own day as the celebration of the coming of spring and the revival of life in nature. It is surely most significant that a part of the Passover celebration in the Jewish Church is the liturgical reading of Canticles. This has come about through no accident, but is rather the survival of an ancient practice that will doubtless continue as long as the world stands. The festival and the book belong together because they have always been together. The book is no longer recited consciously to work sympathetically on the gods of nature that there may be a revival of life and vegetation, but that this was its original significance there can be no question. In fact the technical name of such a liturgy, *zāmîr*, actually survives in Cant. 2:10 ff.:

> Arise, my love, and come away; for, lo, the winter is past;
> The rain is over and gone; the flowers appear on the earth;
> The time of ritual-song has come, and the voice of the turtle-dove is heard;
> The fig-tree is ripening her figs, and the grapevines give forth fragrance.

[3] Another remnant is in Ps. 45.

As Ehrlich has pointed out,[4] derivatives from *zāmar* in the sense of singing are used for ritual-songs only (e. g. Ex. 15:2; Lev. 25: 3, 4; Isa. 5:6). For this very reason he and others would give to *zāmîr* here the meaning, "pruning", on the assumption that Canticles is a secular song, but pruning is not done so late in the spring and it is more in harmony with the passage and the general character of the book to retain the usual meaning "ritual-song". The same word in Babylonian, *zamâru*, means ritual-song and appears as the title of Tammuz liturgies.[5] Three other words of like nature are used in Cant. 1:4: *gîl* (cf. Ar. *ǧāla*, "to go round, be excited", suggesting the religious frenzy of the fertility cult); *šāmaḥ* (often used of religious exultation, e. g. Lev. 23:40; I Sam. 11:15; Isa. 9:2, cf. Babyl. *šamâḫu* and its derivative *šamḫatu*, a name of one of the several orders of Ishtar votaries); and *zākar* (Babyl. *zakâru*, "to recite, invoke, praise",[6] cf. Jer. 3:16, from which comes *zikru*, the name of another order of Ishtar votaries).

Another key to the interpretation of Canticles is found in the Mishna, Taanith IV, 8, where it is

[4] *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel*, VII, 7.

[5] E. g. *KAR*, IV, No. 158, Rev. I, 23.

[6] Hence *zikkuratu*=minaret, the tower of the muezzin. I owe this to a suggestion of Dr. Godbey.

stated that it was customary at the Wood Festival on the fifteenth of Ab and at the close of the Day of Atonement for "the maidens of Jerusalem" (cf. Cant. 1:5, *et passim*) to go out and dance in the vineyards. There was alternate singing between them and the youths, and the latter were wont to use the words of Cant. 3:11. Again we have Canticles connected with practices that clearly originated in fertility rites. These dances of youths and maidens, like those in Judg. 21:19 ff. and 9:27, had their beginnings in the worship of the deities of life and vegetation, and that Canticles was used in the liturgy is clear evidence of its original character.

This interpretation of Canticles clears up a host of problems connected with the book. It explains how the allegorical interpretation came to be attached to it so early, because after all the book is a kind of allegory—the wooing and the marriage of father god and mother goddess that there may be life in the world. By working on the visible ancient man believed he could influence the invisible to like results.[7] Accordingly, in the fertility cult someone represented the god, another the goddess; there was the wooing of the two; and the rites culminated in their marriage

[7] This we call sympathetic magic.

and union. This was supposed to have like effects on the deities themselves and the result would be fertility in nature, since the gods were nature. This is exactly what we have in Canticles. A maid and her beloved are wooing each other to the end that there may be a revival of life in the world (cf., e. g., Cant. 6:11; 7:13; 2:10 ff.). Many of the fertility deities were deified kings and ofttimes in the liturgy the king himself played the part of the god.[8] Hence a frequent title of the god is king, and another even more frequent is shepherd. Indeed it is the usual designation of the god. Both of these terms are the regular appellatives of the bridegroom in Canticles. The alleged rivalry between a king and a shepherd nowhere exists. There is only one lover as there is only one maid, the one in the original liturgy impersonating the god and the other the goddess.

On the generally accepted interpretation of the book it has been found exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to explain how Canticles ever got into the sacred Canon of the Hebrews. On our interpretation there is no difficulty at all. It got into the Canon because it was an ancient book, a religious book, and one that had always

[8] See *AJSL*, XXXIX, 6, n. 4.

been religious. Its religious import, however, had not always remained the same but had changed to meet new conditions, beliefs and practices. In certain quarters there may have survived dim recollections of its connection with the fertility cult, which through prophetic opposition had in the later period come into religious disfavor. For this or another reason some communities seem not to have used the book. But most communities did, and it was usage and not council decision that decided the contents of the Canon. As Canticles came to be incorporated into the Yahweh cult, the symbols and material allusions were supplemented by others drawn from the Temple cultus.[9] Because of the reference to king the name of Solomon as king *par excellence* got attached to the book, or it may have come as a later interpretation of the god name Shelem (i. e. Dod or Tammuz), which may have stood originally in the text.[10] Finally came the day of the allegorical interpretation of the book and this together with the prestige of Solomon's name did much to smooth its way to general acceptance. Thus there was little ground left for opposition and Rabbi Akiba accordingly

[9] See the suggestive article by Mr. Schoff elsewhere in the volume.
[10] Cf. Erbt, *Die Hebräer*, pp. 197 ff.

found no difficulty in getting universal acceptance for it, and anathema were those who by force of long habit still sung it as a wine-song,[11] another evidence of its early character.

The personal epithet regularly applied to the bridegroom in Canticles is *dôdî*, elsewhere always translated "my uncle". It is not a little strange that in Canticles and Isa. 5:1 tradition has given to the term the unusual meaning "my beloved". The regular word for "beloved" in Hebrew is *yādîd*. How this meaning came to be given to another word whose ordinary meaning is something quite different must needs be explained and the explanation on our hypothesis is not far to seek. In *dôdî* we have none other than a survival of the god name Dod or Adad, the fertility god of the west and the Palestinian counterpart of Tammuz.[12] *Dôdî*, in the original liturgy "My Dod", was a form of address quite like "My Damu" and "My Tammuz", which appear so often in the Tammuz liturgies.[13] Later generations, however, lost sight of the original meaning of the expression as the Song

[11] Tosephta, Sanhedrin, XII; cf. also the parallel passage, Talmud Babli, Sanhedrin, 101a.

[12] For the evidences see *AJSL*, XXXIX, 4 f.

[13] See Langdon, *Tammuz and Ishtar*, *passim*.

became a conventionalized form for the celebration of the coming of spring; the phrase lost its earlier connection, and came to be traditionally interpreted "my beloved". But even though we thus render it, there is one passage where the god name still stands, Cant. 5:9: "Who but Dod is thy beloved!"[14] Dod must have stood here as a proper name long after its significance had been forgotten. It is rather striking, too, that the Syriac never translates *dôdî*, but always transliterates it, just as if it were a proper name.

Solomon, as already indicated, may be the later interpretation of an original Shelem; and another place where a name or title of the god is evidently preserved is the difficult verse, Cant. 6:12. Whatever the rest of the verse may mean, *'ammî*, "my *'amm*", must originally have been a term of address. The regular meaning of *'amm* in early Semitic is "father".[15] It is the name of the national god of the Kataban Arabs,

[14] The usual translation: "What is thy beloved more than another beloved?" supplies the word "another" and is grammatically questionable. *Māh*, "who?", is the Babyl. *manu*; or *h* is a scribal error for *y*, the two being very similar in the early script and often confused; cf. Cant. 3:6, where *mî* is evidently a scribal error for *māh;* see Budde, *Das Hohelied*, p. 16.

[15] For the literature on this see Nielsen, *Der dreieinige Gott*, I, 77, n. 1

a nature deity,[16] and "father" is the regular appellation of the god in all fertility liturgies. The word that accompanies *'ammî*, viz. *nādîb*, is connected with Babylonian *nindabû* (Sum. *šug*-d*ninni*), which originally meant corn-offering to Ishtar and then came to mean food-offering in general.[17] The usual translation of *nādîb* is "noble", and descriptive terms like this (e. g. fair, beautiful, lovely, beloved, pure, majestic, distinguished) are regularly applied to the god in the fertility hymns and appear with great frequency, even as they do in Canticles. Rather strikingly Yahweh never once appears in the book. When the liturgy was incorporated into the Yahweh cult, it was deemed sufficient to transfer the titles to him without adding his name. Dod was identified with Yahweh.[17a]

If the god name Dod and other titles still survive in the text, we should expect to find somewhere a reference to his consort Shala, and

---

[16] Hommel, *ZDMG*, 1895, p. 525; Nielsen, *Der sabäische Gott Ilmuḳah*, pp. 62 ff. For this god in the Old Testament see Wood, *JBL* XXXV, 83 ff.

[17] Cf. Langdon, *Tammuz and Ishtar*, pp. 66, 155.

[17a] This is confirmed by the proper name in II Chron. 20:37, which may be read "Dod is Yahu" (MT) or "Dodi is Yah" (LXX); cf. the earlier name Eldod, "Dod is God," Num. 11:26.

we are not disappointed. In Cant. 7:1 the name applied to the bride is "the Shulammite". Commentators have ever been at a loss to explain why such a title should have been applied to her, but again we have a survival that betrays the early character of the book. As in the course of time *dôdî* came to be misinterpreted, so it was with the name of the goddess Shala, or Shulmanitu, as we now know was her title in Jerusalem.[18] When Solomon's name got attached to the book, the word was confused with "the Shunammite" of I Kgs. 1:3, and in course of time she that was originally the goddess Shala came to be understood as a simple maiden. But it is very strange that this maiden is so frequently connected with the Lebanon (Cant. 2:14; 4:8, 12-15; 7:5), the mountain home of Adad and Shala,[19] and in Cant. 4:15 (cf. also 4:12 ff.) the original reference must assuredly have been to the Palestinian goddess of vegetation and life-giving rains:

> A fountain of gardens, a well of living waters,
> And flowing streams from Lebanon art thou.

The usual appellation applied to the bride is *ra'yāh*, evidently a derivitive of *rā'āh*, "to mourn,

[18] See *AJSL*, XXXIX, 7, n. 1.
[19] See *AJSL*, XXXIX, 7.

languish" (see note 26 below), and it would seem to be no accident that this is found elsewhere in Judg. 11: 37 (*kethîbh*), where the term is applied to the priestesses who yearly bewailed the death of vegetation typified by the sacrifice of Jephthah's daughter.[20] She is the only child of her parents (Cant. 6: 9), even as Persephone and Jephthah's daughter.

As all commentators have noted, the language of Canticles is full of symbolic terms and material allusions. I have shown in detail elsewhere[21] that most of these like shepherd, vine, vineyard, house of wine, raisin-cakes, myrrh, dove, gazelle, hind, apple, mandrake, pomegranate, cedar, cypress, palm-tree, garden, park, sword-lily or hyacinth, henna, palanquin, couch, find their simplest and easiest explanation as originally concerned with the fertility cult. Some of them are utterly pointless on any other hypothesis and have always occasioned difficulty to the commentator, as, for example, the reference to foxes (Cant. 2: 15), the dance of the Mahanaim (7: 1), the adjuration to the maidens (2: 7, *et passim*), the bridegroom's designation of his loved one as sister and bride (4: 8 ff.; 5: 1),

[20] So all modern commentators; see, e. g., Burney, *The Book of Judges*, pp. 332 ff.

[21] *AJSL*, XXXIX, 7 ff.

and the veiled allusion to the bridegroom as brother (1:6; 3:4; 8:1) and as son (8:5). If there is any one thing that is distinctive of the fertility cult in all its forms, it is just this confusion as to the relationship between god and goddess. The "youths" and "maidens" so frequently mentioned in Canticles (e. g. 1:3, 5, 7; 2:2, 3, 7; 4:4; 3:5, 7, 10, 11; 6:8, 9; 8:13) have their counterpart in the youths and maidens (the sacred prostitutes or votaries) that play such a prominent role in the fertility cult everywhere and were so frequently condemned by the Hebrew prophets. The regular word in Hebrew is *qādēš*, fem. *qedēšāh*, (Babyl. *qadišu*, fem. *qadištu*). Twice in Canticles (6:8, 9) appears the word *pîlegeš*,[22] "concubine", but, as is usual in the liturgies, we have ordinarily euphemistic terms like maiden (*'almāh*, Babyl. *ardatu*, *mertu* and *zêrmašîtu*), queen (*malkāh*, Babyl. *bêltu* and *šarratu*), daughter (*bat*, Babyl. *martu*), son (*bēn*, Babyl. *maru*), hero (*gibbôr*, Babyl. *qarradu* and *edlu*), and companion (*rê'eh* and *ḫeber*, Babyl. *ebru*).

In Cant. 1:6 we have clearly a reference to the

[22] Evidently a derivative from *pâlag*, "to divide, spread", the *š* being originally the fem. ending *t*: cf. Ez. 16:25 and *KAR*, IV, No. 158, Rev. II, 9.

drying up of vegetation under the scorching rays of the sun:

> Look not upon me that I am blackened,
> That Shemesh has scorched me, my mother's son has burned me.
> He made me keeper of the vineyards, but my own vineyard have I not kept.[23]

Here it is the goddess (mother-earth) who languishes. Ordinarily it is the god who dies and to bring him back to life the goddess descends to the netherworld in search of him. To this we have many references in Canticles (e. g. 1: 7, 8; 3: 1-4; 5: 2-7; 6: 1-3; 8: 1, 2, 13, 14), of which the most striking is probably Cant. 6: 1-3:

> *Maidens:*
> Whither has thy Dod gone, O fairest of women?
> Whither has thy Dod turned, that we may seek him with thee?[24]
> *Goddess:*
> My Dod has gone down to his garden,[25] to the bed of spices;
> To languish[26] in his garden and to gather hyacinths.

---

[23] For the justification of this translation see *AJSL*, XXXIX, 10.

[24] Cf. the following address to Ishtar out of a Tammuz Liturgy, *CT*, XV, 20, 24 f.:
> Whither has thy brother gone, the lamented one?
> Whither has Tammuz gone, the bewailed one?

[25] I. e. the netherworld, "garden" (Babyl. *kirû*) being one of the many terms used for the underworld in the fertility liturgies; see, e. g., Zimmern, *Sumerische Kultlieder*, No. 26, VII, 4, 6; *KAR*, IV, No. 158, Rev. II, 26, 28, 35; cf. Albright, *AJSL*, XXXVI, 280 ff.

[26] This meaning for *rā'āh* is based on its probable derivative *ra'*, *râ'āh*, "misery", cf. Erbt, *Die Hebräer*, p. 201. If one prefers the usual meaning, "to shepherd", the significance of the passage is not at all affected. A frequent rôle of the fertility god is that of shepherd, as we have already noted.

I belong to my Dod and my Dod belongs to me, who
languisheth among the hyacinths.[27]

Elusive is the god and long and tedious is the search after him[28] (Cant. 2: 4-6):

Bring me to the house of wine,[29] and serve me with love;
Reinforce me with raisin-cakes, refresh me with apples;[30]
Let his left hand caress my head, his right hand embrace me.[31]

Cant. 8: 1 f.:

O that someone would bring thee back, O brother, to me, thou
who sucked the breasts of my mother,
That I might find thee in the street, kiss thee, and people no
longer despise me,
That I might lead thee to the house of my mother, to the
chamber of her who bore me.

Cant. 5: 6 ff.:

I sought him but could not find him, I called him but he did not
answer me.
The watchmen found me, they smote me, they wounded me,
They stripped me of my mantle, the guardians of the walls.
I adjure you, O maidens of Jerusalem, if ye find my Dod,
That ye tell him that I am sick with love.

---

[27] The rhythm here is 3+2 beats. Nothing is lost in line 4, as many scholars maintain, but the line, 2+2, is simply a variant of the 3+2.

[28] Jastrow, *Song of Songs, passim,* calls the youth the lover and the maid the beloved, but it is rather just the opposite, as all have recognized. It is the maid that is the lover, even as it is the goddess in the fertility cult.

[29] I. e. the bridal chamber, frequently mentioned in the liturgies.

[30] Raisin-cakes and apples figure prominently in the fertility cult everywhere. For the former in the O. T. see Hos. 3: 1; Isa. 16: 7; and Jer. 7: 18; 44: 19.

[31] For the justification of the translation cf. Jastrow, *op. cit.*, pp. 170f.

Eventually, however, she finds her lord (Cant. 3:3ff.), even as Ishtar found Tammuz:

> The watchmen found me: 'Have ye seen him whom my soul loveth?'
> Scarcely had I gotten by them, when I found him whom my soul loveth.
> I held him and would not let him go, until I brought him to the house of my mother.

The watchmen who impede the maiden's search and strip off her mantle (Cant. 5:7; cf. 3:3; 8:11) remind one of the watchmen who impeded the descent of Ishtar to the netherworld and stripped her of her garments.[32] In the liturgies, as in Canticles, the netherworld is represented as a sheep-fold, as a city with streets, and as a garden.[33] In Cant. 8:6 we have the actual names "Sheol" and "death":

> For love is as mighty as death, as strong as Sheol;
> As for passion, its bolts are bolts of fire, fierce flames;
> Many waters cannot quench it, nor rivers overcome it.

This in its original context was manifestly a reference to the power of the love of the goddess to win the god back from the netherworld despite the floods and other obstacles that lay between this world and the next.[34] The

---

[32] *Descent of Ishtar*, Obv. 42 ff. (most recently translated by Ungnad, *Die Religion der Babylonier und Assyrer*, pp. 142 ff.).

[33] For these and other names of the netherworld see Radau, *Sumerian Hymns and Prayers to God Dumu-zi* (*BE*, Series A, XXX, Part 1), pp. 19 ff., 52 f.

[34] Cf. also Cant. 4:9: "Thou hast heartened me" (Babyl. *labâbu*).

purpose of the ritual was to help in the accomplishment of this so that there might be a reawakening of life in the dead world. To this we have several references in Canticles (e. g. 6: 11; 7: 13; 2: 10 ff.). The youth and maiden, originally impersonating god and goddess, are manifestly engaged in certain rites to impart productiveness to the soil,[35] and Canticles, as it stood in its early form, was clearly the liturgy of the occasion.

If our interpretation of Canticles is correct, we should expect to find references to northern localities in Palestine rather than southern, because it was in the agricultural north rather than in the semi-nomadic south that the cult flourished. And this is exactly what we find (e. g. Lebanon, Hermon, Damascus, Tirzah, Sharon, Gilead, Heshbon, Mahanaim, Bathrabbim).[36] Also we should expect to find many points of contact in language between Canticles and other fertility liturgies, particularly the Semitic, which we know best in the Babylonian.

---

[35] An early English May-day rite was that of having a young couple roll down the hill in each other's arms in order to impart their productiveness to the land; Hazlitt, *Dictionary of Faiths and Folklore*, I, 287. Similar rites prevailed the world over.

[36] This fact has always been a problem to the commentators but finds an easy explanation on our hypothesis.

Again we are not disappointed. Strikingly characteristic of Canticles is the repetition of passages, and this is also a feature of the Tammuz hymns. The linguistic peculiarities of Canticles are numerous and striking. There are a remarkably large number of hapaxlegomena, many peculiar words and forms, a pronounced deviation from the ordinary rules of grammar and syntax, and other irregularities that bespeak its non-Hebraic origin. As all scholars agree, the fertility cult was taken over by the Hebrews from the agricultural Canaanites when they gave up their early nomadic life and settled on the land, and with the cult they naturally took over the liturgies and thus the linguistic peculiarities of Canticles are to be accounted for. The usual explanation of these as provincialisms has not a whit of evidence to stand on.

An outstanding feature of the language of Canticles is the uniform use of the particle *še* for *'ašer*, the origin of which is unquestionably to be found in the Babylonian *ša*. It came to the Hebrews through the Canaanites whose civilization we know was practically the same as that of the Babylonians and whose language was

essentially the same.[37] Of the many peculiar words and hapaxlegomena listed by Cannon[38] a goodly number have their origin in Babylonian. Cannon himself notes the following: *kōtel* (Cant. 2:9)=Babyl. *kutallu*; *ṭanap* (5:3)=*ṭanâpu*; *'ommān* (7:2)=*ummânu*; *rāhiṭ* (1:17 *kerî*; 7:6)=*râṭu*. To these may be added others like *'êkāh* (1:7), meaning "where?"=*êkâ*; *tôr* (1:10, 11) from the root *târu*; *'ōper* (2:9, *et passim*)=*apparû*; *ḥarakkîm* (2:9) from the root *ḥarâku*, "to cut in"; *zāmîr* (2:12)=*zamâru*; *rāpad* (2:5; cf. the noun *repîdāh*, 3:10)=*rapâdu*; *gālaš* (4:1; 6:5)=*galâšu*; *raḥṣāh* (4:2; 6:6)=*riḥṣu*; *lābab* (4:9)=*labâbu*; *taltallîm* (5:11)=*taltallu*, "palm-branch"; *millêt* (5:12)=*mîlu*, "flood"; *dāgal* (5:10; 2:4 pointing the noun as verb, *digelû*)=*dagâlu*; *'ešet* (5:14)=*isîtu*, "column"; *šēš* (5:15)=*šaššu*; *'aggān* (7:3)=*aganu*; *sansinnîm* (7:9)=*sissinnu*; *argāmān* (3:10; 7:6)=*argamannu*; *dābab* (7:10)=*dabâbu*; *reqaḥ*, (8:2)=*riqqu*, "spice". From these lists it is clear that many of the peculiar words of Canticles are Babylonian-Canaanite loan-words and the number could doubtless be

[37] On this all scholars are agreed, although they differ sharply as to which were the borrowers and so we have Pan-Babylonians arrayed over against Pan-Amorites. The truth lies probably between the two extremes. There were borrowings both ways and a common culture background.

[38] *The Song of Songs*, pp. 143 ff.

enlarged. Some like *appiryôn* (3:9), *pardēs* (4:13, cf. Babyl. *pardîsu*), *nērd* (1:12; 4:13, 14), and *'egôz* (6:11) probably came through Canaanite from some other language. Others like *harûzîm* (1:10), *pagāh* (2:13), *semādar* (2:13, 15; 7:13), *rāsîs* (5:2), *qewuṣṣôt* (5:2, 11), *šōr* (7:3), *mezeg* (7:3), *kōper* (1:14; 4:13), *'ahālôt* (4:14), and *karkōm* (4:14) may well be loan-words from the Arabians, among whom we know the Tammuz cult had early sway. As Cannon has shown,[39] much of the vocabulary of Canticles is old. In fact it is very old, even archaic in places (e. g. *sûsātî*, the gen. case ending *î*, 1:9; *satû*, the old nom. ending *û*, 2:11; *lēkî*, the old form for *lāk*, 2:13). Accordingly, there is every reason to believe that the Song in its early form came more or less directly from the Canaanites. This finds further support in other peculiarities of the book, as, for example, the frequent use of the masculine form in both verbs and pronouns to serve for both genders, the free use of *min* partitive (Babyl. *ištu*), the paraphrastic genitive, the compounding of prepositions, and the use of the preposition "to" after prepositions and verbs.[40] These are all the sort of thing found

[39] *Op. cit.*, pp. 142 ff.

[40] For examples of all of these see Cannon, *op. cit.*, pp. 142 ff.

over and over again in Babylonian–Canaanite. Rather significant too is the number sixty (Cant. 3:7; 6:8), suggestive as it is of the sexagesimal system of the Babylonians. The so-called Aramaisms of Canticles are peculiar to this book alone and scarcely any of them are the Aramaisms that we find elsewhere in the Old Testament.[41] The peculiarities of Canticles are not provincialisms nor late Aramaisms, but are rather the marks of its foreign origin[42] and its connection with the Tammuz liturgies, and this is borne out by the comparison of its vocabulary with such liturgies[43] and with the terms used in Isa. 5:1 ff.; 17:10, 11; Joel 1:8 ff. and in parts of Hosea, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, where we have the prophets railing at the cult and derisively using technical terms and phrases from its liturgy. The language of Canticles, with the exception of those words and passages that came later to be attached to the book, is cult language, and manifestly cult language of the Tammuz liturgies.

---

[41] For details see Cannon, *op. cit.*, p. 150.

[42] Its unhebraic character has been remarked by scholars but never satisfactorily explained.

[43] For some details see the translation of *KAR*, IV, No. 158, appended below. There is scarcely a word here that does not have its equivalent in Canticles.

I have pointed out elsewhere[44] a few of the many Egyptian, Babylonian, and Greek parallels to Canticles, of which the most striking is probably the text published by Ebeling, *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur religiösen Inhalts*, IV, No. 158. At the time of writing my earlier article I had access only to Barton's partial translation and had not seen the original copy. Barton translates the text as a single hymn, but it is rather a catalog of a large collection of hymns or liturgies. Accordingly, instead of having one parallel to Canticles we have many, but unfortunately we have the first lines only and not the complete texts. Enough is given, however, to indicate the decided similarity between Canticles and these songs of love, *irâtu*, as they are called. Indeed a closer parallel would be hard to find. The structure of the songs is the same (two lovers representing god and goddess wooing each other and alternating in the praise of each other's charms); the general theme is the same (love); many of the phrases are quite identical; the figures are introduced in similar fashion; the lines breathe the same delight in love; and the intent of all is manifestly to bring

[44] *AJSL*, XXXIX, 1 ff. For striking parallels in the Gilgamesh Epic beside those noted by me see Daiches, *OLZ*, XV, Sp. 60 ff.

about the awakening of life in nature.[45] They are liturgies of the fertility cult.

From every point of view, accordingly, Canticles would seem to find its most natural and most satisfactory explanation as the survival of an early liturgy of the fertility cult. On this interpretation its difficulties, that have always so beset the commentator, vanish into thin air and the Song takes on new significance and new meaning. Instead of being one of the latest of Hebrew compositions it is one of the earliest. Instead of being secular it is distinctly religious, the Song of Songs, the best of all songs, and to Rabbi Akiba, as doubtless to others, "the holy of holies".[46]

[45] To indicate more fully the parallels I have appended hereto a translation of the more pertinent lines of the Babylonian text.

[46] See Mishna, Yadaim, III, 5.

APPENDIX

Babylonian Parallels to Canticles, *KAR*, No. 158

A few years ago Ebeling published a catalog of hymns,[1] among which are a number strikingly similar to Canticles. The text has been partially translated by Ebeling,[2] Barton,[3] and Langdon.[4] That three representative Assyriologists of three different countries should differ so radically in their translations is surprising. I venture to add another translation, which differs considerably from the others, but is, I trust, more faithful to the original. I give here only those lines that are pertinent to our purpose, viz. Rev., Col. II, which is strictly Col. III, since the columns on the reverse ought to be numbered in the opposite order from that given by Ebeling, his Col. I giving a summary of the contents of the whole tablet and hence being the last column of the text. From this column, lines 45 ff., we learn that there was a goodly number

---

[1] *KAR*, IV, No. 158.
[2] *MDOG*, No. 58, pp. 49 f.
[3] *Archeology and the Bible*, 3rd. ed., pp. 464 ff.
[4] *JRAS*, 1921, pp. 169 ff.

of songs in the catalog of Col. II, but the exact number has not been preserved. Col. II, however, retains the first lines of 51 of them, a few of them partly broken. They are called *irâtu*, pl. of *irtu* (Sum. *gab.*) This term Langdon takes as meaning secular love songs, but they are rather religious songs connected with the Tammuz-Ishtar cult, as Ebeling and Barton have already noted. This is indicated by the direct reference to Nana (Ishtar) in line 38, by the religious character of the catalog in general, and by the whole tenor of the songs themselves. The word *irtu* is ordinarily used of the male breast, but is also used of the female.[5] It is frequently used of mother earth and of the netherworld and would seem to have that connotation here.

KAR, No. 158, Rev., Col. II.

1. [*ap?*]-*lu-us-ka-ma* . . . . . .
   I beheld thee (*masc.*) and . . . . . .
2. *up-ḫa ki-i kakkab bu-*[*ru-me?*].
   Shine out like a star of the sky!

---

[5] So Holma, *Körperteile*, pp. 44 ff., as against Langdon, *loc. cit.*, p. 183.

3. *i-na ṣi-iḫ-ti ša ṣi-e-k[a].*[6]
   In a dirge over thy (*masc.*) death.

4. *an-nu-u ṣi-bu-tu ša ḫu-du ka-bat-ti.*
   This is the desire which rejoiceth my heart.

5. *ip-šu pi-i-ka at-mu balâṭi-ia šum-me-ḫa-ni-ma.*
   The utterance of thy (*masc.*) mouth is the word of my life; prosper thou me!

6. *napḫar 23 i-ra-a-tu ša e-šir-te.*[7]
   A total of 23 *irtu*-songs[8] for the decachord.

7. *ki-e ṣi-ḫa-a-ku a-na na-aḫ-ši.*[9]
   How I do long for the abounding one!

8. *û-um e-en im-ni-ia iš-ḫi-ṭa-an-ni.*
   The day that the lord of my right hand embraced me.

9. *i li-ḳi a-ma-aṣ-ṣi a-na ma-a-ri.*
   Come, take me![10] I give welcome[11] to the son.[12]

---

[6] From the root *ṣe'u*, to destroy, HWB, 565 b, not the hypothetical *ṣe'u* as Langdon, *loc. cit.* p. 183, n. 2.

[7] On this see Langdon, *loc. cit.*, p. 183.

[8] Of these 23 songs only the five given above have been preserved.

[9] Cf. *diš-tar ḳi-bi-i na-ḫa-ši*, "O Ishtar, command abundance!", King, *Babylonian Magic and Sorcery*, No. 8, 3.

[10] Cf. lines 10, 16, 50 below, and Cant. 1: 2 ff.; 2: 6; 4: 16; 7: 12 ff.; 8 :1 ff.

[11] Literally, "I spread (the feet)"; cf. Ez. 16: 25, and note on *pîlegeš*, "concubine", Cant. 6: 8, 9 above.

[12] The regular appellation of Tammuz: *Dumu, Damu*, "son"; *Dumu-zi*, "true son".

10. *ma-te-ma be-lu te-ru-ba i-na-an-na.*
    At any time, O lord, thou mayest enter now.

11. *ḫi-i-pa-a-ku a-na da-di-ka.*
    I am pressed to thy (*masc.*) breast.

12. *it-ti šim-ta-a-at*[13] *mu-ši-ti.*
    With the fates of night.

13. *šumu-u ša ma-a-ru šamma*[14] *šam-ša-a-ku.*[15]
    By the name of the son I revive(?) the vegetation.

14. *a am-mar ša-ma-an*[16] *irṣi-ti.*
    Ah, I behold the fat of the earth.

15. *û-mu ub-la bu-su-ra-tu-ma ḫu-ud lib-bi.*
    The day bringeth gladness, even joy of the heart.

16. *e-la*[17]*-ia ma-a-ru lu na-me-ir*[18] *ir-ba.*
    Upon me may the son beam; come thou in!

---

[13] False pl. of *šimtu*. We have a reference here to the death of Tammuz, as also in line 3 above; cf. the expression for dying, *alâku ana šimat mûši*.

[14] Cf. one of the titles of Tammuz, *Ab-ú*, "father of vegetation", Zimmern, *Der babylonische Gott Tamūz*, p. 8; Langdon, *Tammuz and Ishtar*, p. 8.

[15] From *šamâšu*, found only here; the root probably of *šamšu*, "sun".

[16] I. e. "fertility", cf. Heb. *šemen*, from the root "to be fat, fertile". Cf. Isa. 5: 1 and Cant. 1: 3, "The fat of *turak* (cf. Babyl. *tarruku*) is thy name (i. e. thy being); therefore do the maidens love thee".

[17] A variant of *elî*, not the prep. *elâ*, as Langdon, *ad loc.*

[18] Not Piel as Langdon, but simple Perm. with *lû* precative.

17. *la-a me-ḫi-ir-ti iš-nu-na-an-ni.*
Not a rival (*fem.*) equalled me.

18. al*ni-ip-pu-ri-ti la-ḫa-na-tu da-šu-up-tu.*
A woman of Nippur is a jar of sweetness.

19. *šu-up-pi ḫu-ul-li.*[19]
Be joyous, be happy!

20. *da-am-ša-aš-ni*[20] *be-la-ni.*
Thou hast caressed me; be thou my lord.

21. *sa-am-mu-ut e-ri-ni ra-am-ka be-lu.*
The fragrance of cedar is thy love, O lord.

22. *a-na bâb e-ni ta-al-li-ka*(!)*-am-ma.*
To the door of the lord[21] she did come.

23. *a-na mu-ši-ti an-ni-ti a-na li-la-ti an-na-ti.*
For this night, for these evenings.

24. *napḫar 17 i-ra-a-tu ša ki-it-me.*
A total of 17 *irtu*-songs for the *kitmu*-instrument.[22]

---

[19] Cf. line 38 below; Rev. III, 6: *ḫu-di-i be-li-it-ni šu-li-li*, "Rejoice, O our lady (i. e. Ishtar), make song"; *KAR*, III, No. 144, Rev. 1: *ḫu-di-i u ri-ši*, "Rejoice and jubilate", likewise addressed to Ishtar. In Canticles cf. 1: 4; 2: 12, discussed in article above.

[20] For *tamšaš*, Prt. of *mašâšu*, on which see Langdon, *JRAS*, 1921, p. 186, n. 1

[21] I. e. in the netherworld, which is frequently represented as the house of Tammuz, see, e. g., Meissner, *SAI*, 3292, where the netherworld is called *bît* d*dumu-zi;* cf. II R. 61, No. 1, 18, *ê a-ra-li*, and *BE*, XXVII, No. 1, IV, 40, where Tammuz is called d*ligir-si ê a-ra-li-ka*, "bridegroom of the house of the netherworld". In Canticles cf. 2: 4, "Bring me to the house of wine".

[22] On this see Langdon, *loc. cit.*, p. 184, n. 2.

25. *ki-e na-aḫ-ša-at ki-e nam-ra-at.*
How gorgeous she is; how resplendent she is!

26. *i-še-' as-ma kirâ la-li-ka.*
She seeketh out[23] the beautiful garden of thy (*masc.*) abundance.[24]

27. *û-ma lib-bi me-lu-la ni-gu-ta.*
Today my heart is joy (and) gladness.

28. *a ri-id kirâ šarri ḫa-ṣi-bu e-ri-ni.*
O, come down to the garden of the king (which) reeks with cedar.[25]

29. *at-ta ma-a-ru ra-i-mu da-di-ni.*[26]
Thou, O son, art a lover of my bosom.

30. *e-bir-tu nâri*[27] *a-lu me-li-li.*[28]
On the other side of the river is the city of lamentation.

---

[23] Literally, "he seeketh", but manifestly masc. for fem., as is frequent in Babylonian, and is likewise characteristic of Canticles.

[24] Manifestly the netherworld to which Tammuz has gone, *kirâ* being one of the many names applied to the netherworld; see note on Cant. 6: 2 in article above and cf. lines 28, 35 below.

[25] Cf. Cant. 4: 16. "King", as already noted, is one of the many epithets applied to Tammuz and is frequent in Canticles.

[26] Not *da-da-ni* as Langdon, *ad loc.*, but the two words are evidently the same.

[27] I. e. the river Hubur, the mythical river of the netherworld. With the Babylonians, as with most, there was a river or sea separating this world from the next.

[28] From the root *elêlu*, "to make music", from which is another derivative, *malîlu*, "flute". Both words are regularly used in connection with the liturgical wailing for the death of Tammuz, e. g. *Descent of Ishtar*, Rev. 56 f.

31. *aš-ru un-ni*[29] *ta-gu-ša araḫ ṣi-ḫa-ti.*[30]
To the place of sorrow thou (*masc.*) didst go in the month of lamentation.

32. *ul-la a-li-ik ma-a-ru.*
Joyously come, O son.[31]

33. *ki-i za-ra-at*[32] *ša at-ḫa-at-ti.*
Like the pavilion of the maidens.[33]

34. *iṣ-ṣur TU ti-id-ku*[34] *ur-ri lal-la-ru ri-gim-ki.*
O bird of life (?), harbinger of light, honey is thy (*fem.*) voice.[35]

---

[29] Piel Infin. of *enû* (Heb. *'ānāh*); cf. note on Cant. 6: 2 in article above. For *ašru unni*=the netherworld cf. Zimmern, *Sumerische Kultlieder*, No. 26, VI, 37, [*k*]*i sir-ra*, "place of lamentation", a name of the netherworld.

[30] Against the translations of Ebeling, Barton and Langdon *ṣîḫtu*, pl. *ṣîḫâti*, is the technical word in Babylonian for "lamentation" (Sum. *isiš*), and the context here and elsewhere in this text indicates this clearly as its meaning. "The month of lamentation" would be the fourth month, "the month of Tammuz," earlier known as "the month of the festival of Tammuz." It was marked by liturgical wailing over the death of Tammuz.

[31] A phrase very frequent in Canticles, e. g. 2: 17; 7: 12; 8: 14; cf. 2: 10, 13; 4: 8.

[32] Cf. the *zâratu* (Sum. *dúr*, the root meaning of which is "to dwell"), "stateroom, pavilion", on the procession-ship of Marduk in which in the rôle of Tammuz he was carried in the New Year's festival to be united in marriage with the mother goddess, *East India House Inscription*, IV, 4; *Wadi Brisa Inscription*, III, 25, 37; cf. also Cant. 3:7 ff.; 1:12, 17.

[33] I. e. the Ishtar votaries; cf. "the maidens" so frequently referred to in Canticles.

[34] Evidently a derivative of *dikû*. The reference is to Ishtar, here described as a bird, bringing light and life to her lord in the underworld. For a striking parallel to the line 8 cf. Cant. 2:14.

[35] A sentiment frequent in Canticles, e. g. 4: 11; 2: 14; 5: 1.

35. *ša-an-da-ba-ak kirî ṣi-ḫa-ti.*
O watchman of the garden of lamentation![36]

36, 37. *û-um-uš*(?) *i-na* a*lla-ar-sa-an ṣi-ḫa-tu i-zi-ka.*
Every day in Larsa lamentation abounds.[37]

38. *ri-i-ši* d*na-na-a i-na kirî e-babbar ša ta-ra-mi.*
Rejoice, O Nana, in the garden of Ebabbara, which thou lovest.

39. *me-ir-tu*[38] *ub-la lib-ba-ša šu-a-ra.*[39]
The maiden whose heart bore lamentation.

40. *ka-ia-nam-ma ki-i sak-ta-ku-ma.*
How can I always keep silent!

41. *a ṣi-iḫ-ku ma-an mârê* (*TUR. TUR*).
O, I long for the couch of the sons.[40]

42. *bar-ma-a-tu*[41] *ênâ* pl-*ia im-da-la-a ši-it-ta.*
My eye-lids are full of sleep.

---

[36] The Babylonians like most peoples thought of the netherworld as guarded by watchmen. In Canticles cf. 5: 7; 8: 11; 3: 3.

[37] I. e. during the time that Tammuz is in the netherworld. This song was evidently a Larsa recension of the liturgy; cf. also line 38 below, where Ebabbara, the temple of Shamash in Larsa, is mentioned.

[38] I. e. Ishtar; cf. Obv. II, 22, where she is so called.

[39] This word appears again only in Creation Epic, I. 24; cf. however, *šu'aru*, one of the names of the netherworld, the abode of Tammuz.

[40] A euphemistic name for the male votaries of the fertility cult; cf. Cant. 2: 3:

Like the apple-tree among the trees of the forest, so is my Dod among the sons.
In his shadow I love to dwell, and his fruit is sweet to my taste.

[41] So called because the lids darken (*barâmu*) the eyes.

43, 44. *ra-am-ka lu-u* aban*KA*[42] *ṣi-ḫa-tu-ka lu-u ḫurâṣu.*
Thy (*masc.*) love is indeed a jewel, thy longing is indeed gold.

45. *ra-a-mi ni-i-ru muš-na-me-ru ṣilli.*
My love is a light, illuminating the shadows.

46. *mu-u-ša aḫ-su-us-ka-ma.*
By night I thought of thee (*masc.*).[43]

47. *ip-šu pi-i-ka.*
The utterance of thy (*masc.*) mouth.

48. *iš-tu ṣa-al-la-ku i-na su-un ma-a-ri.*
After I lay in the bosom of the son.

49. *ri-bi-ka*[44] *ša* aban*ukni šadi.*
Thy (*masc.*) passion is of the lapis-lazuli of the mountain.

50. *ḫa-di-iš ak-ša šar-ru.*
Joyfully hasten, O king.

51. *mi-ig-ru ḫa-am-ru.*[45]
Welcome is the lover.

---

[42] On this stone, as yet unidentified, see Streck, *ZA*, 18, 180 f.

[43] Cf. Cant. 3: 1.

[44] For the meaning see Langdon, *ad loc.*

[45] One of the many names of Tammuz, *ḫamer Ištar;* see, e. g., Zimmern, *Der babyl. Gott Tamūz*, p. 7; Langdon, *Tammuz and Ishtar*, p. 28, n. 2. Rather curiously Ebeling, Barton and Langdon all failed to identify this word.

52. *i-na la-li-ki ḫu-un-bi.*
In thy (*fem.*) abundance flourish.

53. *u-ka-a-al ra-am-*[*ka?*].
I will retain thy (*masc.*) love.

54. *i-na ša-a-ar* .....
In the breath of .....

55. *ti-* .....

(Rest broken)

VI

THE OFFERING LISTS IN THE SONG OF SONGS

and their political significance

WILFRED H. SCHOFF
The Commercial Museum
Philadelphia

"At our doors are all manner of precious fruits,
New and old,
Which I have laid up for thee, O my Beloved."
—Cant. 7:14

The Song of Songs has received interpretations differing more widely than those of any other book in the Old Testament. In the conventionalized Jewish view, it expresses the love of Yahweh for Israel. Christians took over that view, modified in certain details, and interpreted the book as an expression of the love of Christ for the Church. According to some scholars, it is a dramatic composition; while others take it to be a chance collection of love lyrics which found its way into the sacred canon because of its popularity.

In none of these views is full allowance made for the many questions that occur. The mystical idea of divine love for an earthly flock personified in the form of a maiden is surely late and

derivative as compared with the book itself. No parallel can be found for the expression of such love in terms so directly human; nor is it probable that a sacred writer would have so handled the subject. It is not a dramatic unity, and no rearrangement of the text has made it so. The publication by Dalman of a collection of modern bridal songs of Syria and Palestine gave some interesting and significant parallels in conception and expression of the theme, but surely did not afford sufficient ground for assuming that a canonical book similar in subject went no further in content.

Without going at length into questions of canonicity, we may assume that the rolls of the temple were there because they referred in some way to the services and ceremonies of the temple. A roll of popular love lyrics would not find its way into the archives merely because some high priest happened to be fond of that kind of literature. If that were the whole story some successor of more puritanical turn of mind would have burned it. A correct interpretation must concern itself not only with details of the imagery—foreign as they are to our modern conventions of taste and propriety. It must go beyond them and explain why that particular roll, written in the ancient language and

expressing, in a fresh and charming way, ideas of primitive man and primitive ritual through which almost every branch of the human race has passed, came to survive in the temple at Jerusalem with additions that point toward a late editing, such as the insertion of Greek and Persian words,[1] and the mention of certain substances that strongly indicate a post-Alexandrine date.[2] The starting point of such interpretation may be the lines quoted at the beginning of this paper—the offering of all manner of precious products laid up, both new and old.

In the endeavor to interpret ceremonial literature, a study of its material details is not without value. Ritual changes slowly, but it does change at intervals, and usually in the direction of including among the offerings the best that the celebrants can afford; as they draw upon wider sources of wealth, so are their offerings diversified.[3] And as ceremonial records are

[1] Persian *pardis*—Palestine had been a Persian province; there is no reason to assume that the word was borrowed from the Greek. *Appiryon* is, of course, Greek *phoreion*. *Kupros*, suggested by Dr. Hyde as Greek, seems rather to be Hebrew *kopher*, a Semitic loan-word in Greek.

[2] Notably, spikenard, saffron and aloes.

[3] The preparation of such lists was a function of the priesthood, going back to primitive magic and incantation. A tablet published by Ebeling, *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur Religiösen Inhalts*, No. 44, and supposed to refer to the priests' school at the Esagila temple at Babylon, mentions as "an essential of the incantation priesthood, the composing of lists of stones and lists of plants." The witches in *Macbeth* are true to type.

crystalized in the sacred writings, they are to a certain extent indices of the economic conditions of their time. That chapter in the book of Exodus[4] in which are specified the substances to be used for the anointing oil and ceremonial incense has been classified with the P document, and assumed by some critics to be late. I find nothing in it that is not paralleled in similar lists of the 18th Dynasty in Egypt—certainly several centuries earlier and well known from the published inscriptions. The single item about which there might be uncertainty is cinnamon. If we must interpret this always as the product of the tree laurel from India and the Far East, we may take it as a later addition; but as I have tried elsewhere to show,[5] it is unnecessary to identify the word with the same product at all periods of history.[6] The positive identification of such words with substances known to modern commerce is often misleading. Carried back to their roots, they may mean no

[4] Ex. 30

[5] JAOS Vol. 40, Part IV, 1920

[6] Professor S. J. Record of Yale has tentatively identified a specimen of the *tagar* wood of the Parsi temples in India, supplied by the writer, with the *Cinnamosma fragrans* of Madagascar, Tanganyika and Kenya, order *Canellaceae*, which may possibly have been the "sweet wood" of the Egyptian records heretofore translated cinnamon. Although brought by the royal ships from the Somali coast, it certainly never grew in that arid region.

more than the specification of, (1) the naturally exuded gum; (2) the thicker gum obtained by scratching or cutting the bark; (3) the resin obtained from pockets in the wood or injuries to the tree, accidental or artificial; (4) strippings of bark, or leaves, twigs or flowers; (5) chips of the wood; (6) cuttings of the roots; (7) seeds, pods or cones; (8) insect galls. That is, the offering included something from every part of the tree or plant, manifesting in various forms its mysterious life. As demand increased and trade extended, certain products of distant and different lands were specified under each of these headings as the best of their kind, and the names applied specifically to them, where in earlier times any local product would have been thought sufficient.

That all this is not mere speculation is indicated by two records still available. In Exodus there are specified for the ceremonial incense stacte (which, in the meaning of the word, is merely a naturally exuded gum), onycha, galbanum, frankincense and salt; and for the anointing oil, flowing myrrh (which is the same thing as stacte), cinnamon, calamus, cassia and olive oil.[7] But in a later book these lists receive

[7] Ex. 30.

substantial additions. In the Babylonian Talmud—and the passage is reprinted in the standard Jewish Prayer Book—there are specified balm, onycha, galbanum, frankincense, myrrh, cassia, spikenard, saffron, costus, aromatic bark, cinnamon, the lye obtained from leeks, wine of Cyprus, salt and two fragrant herbs the identification of which is uncertain.[8] This seems to mean that in post-exilic times and under the influence of the wider markets available in Babylonia and familiarized during the exile, the ceremonial of the temple was substantially enriched by the addition of various aromatics unknown in pre-exilic days, notably spikenard, saffron, costus and "aromatic" which may represent a borrowing of the Persian *boi* or *bod*.[9]

The festivals and ceremonies familiar to early Palestine would impress modern eyes as unconventional. The accounts of travelers in equatorial Africa might give a more exact description of them than the books of the Old Testament in their present form. There were seasonal festivals, spring, summer and autumn, and from them grew most of the ritual of the

[8] *Cerithoth* 6-A: Standard Prayer Book p. 239

[9] as to which cf. Laufer, *Sino-Iranica*, p. 193

Jewish state. With the settlement of cities the pastoral viewpoint changed and opposite parties developed; but because the puritan conventions finally dominated we need not suppose that the earlier customs or practices were entirely lost. On that happy day when David brought the Ark to Jerusalem, just captured from the Jebusites, he entered the city at the head of his troops dancing and naked, girt only with a linen ephod, in recognition of an ancient custom familiar alike to his own people and those of the conquered city. Budding puritanism expressed itself through his reproachful wife, who said "How did the King of Israel get him honor today", and he asserted his duty so to act, first, as a Prince over Israel, and second, as honoring the Lord by making merry before Him.[10] Ceremonial dancing continued and still continues, but the dancers are otherwise adorned than with linen ephods and their adornment has kept pace with the services and offerings at the altar.

The Song of Songs is still ordered to be read during the Passover, clearly indicating that it has been brought down from the primitive spring festival. This was a time of offering of

[10] 2 Sam. 6.

fruits of the last harvest that the coming season might be fruitful. The mention of offerings new and old recalls this ancient practice, and it is codified in the book of Leviticus, which gives some common-sense advice about storing grain against a year of famine, while at the same time prescribing a practice to prevent a barren year: "until these fruits come in ye shall eat of the old store".[11] Originally grain, these offerings were extended to include, as the text has it, all manner of pleasant things.

The customs at these spring festivals are strikingly similar wherever found. There is no need here to elaborate upon the wealth of material gathered by Frazer.[12] Fertility of the earth was supposed to be obtained by human mating, whether tribal or representative. Frazer has shown again in his lectures how this was one of the duties of royalty, and how that duty passed on to other kings from year to year.[13] The very word, king, is linked with kin—that is, he was the representative of his tribe in matters ceremonial before he was clothed with temporal power, and kings have never

[11] Lev. 25:22

[12] *Adonis, Attis and Osiris*

[13] *The Early History of the Kingship*

altogether lost their ceremonial functions. A king and queen would be chosen every spring to celebrate and represent Tammuz and Ishtar, whether or not there were ruling monarchs, and under the monarchy the ruling king and queen inherited their duties. It is a striking fact that in the wedding festivals of modern Palestine the bride and groom are called king and queen. But it would be a mistake to interpret this as dignifying them with temporal and temporary titles. Rather are they, continuing the ancient language, votaries of the god and goddess of love. Professor Meek has gone far toward solving this problem by his identification of the two characters in the Song of Songs with Tammuz and Ishtar, and his interpretation of My Beloved rather as My Dod, that is, My Tammuz, can hardly be gainsaid.[14] Frazer has even suggested that David, ("beloved") was a name assumed by the conqueror of the Jebusites, and for the reason that in the conquered city the Tammuz cult was dominant. Meek is no

[14] *Canticles and the Tammuz Cult*, AJSLL Vol. 39, No. 1, Oct. 1922. Cf. 2 Sam. 23:24, "Elhanan the son of Dod of Bethlehem". In this connection Rostovtseff, *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia*, 33-34, has some interesting remarks on the gradual displacement of the matriarchal cult of the Mother Goddess by the patriarchal cult of a God of Heaven.

doubt right also in interpreting the Shulamite as rather the woman of Salem who may be equated with Shulmanitu, otherwise Ishtar of Urusilim-ma, and Erbt was probably right in explaining Solomon in the text as a later rendering of Shelem, another name of Tammuz. The name of the place itself may be taken as city of Shelem or Tammuz. The title of the book may be read as Song of Songs that is of Shelem.

So in this conquered stronghold of the Canaanites may an ancient Canaanitish custom have survived, softened down and smoothed over according to the tastes of later times, and yet in principle unchanged. It is a far cry from the modern rite of baptism, with its phrase about being born again, to early rites when a death and re-birth were simulated as a part of every man's admission to the tribe, often considered invalid unless there were at least one actual death during the ceremony. William Simpson interpreted the book of Jonah in this way, as the survival of an initiatory rite.[15] Whether Jonah was or was not swallowed by a real whale was not the question; the point was that passage into and out of a stage whale, or fish, was a

[15] *The Jonah Legend*, London 1899

ceremony through which every member of the circle had passed.

From David dancing naked at the head of his men to Solomon who exceeded all the kings of the earth in riches and wisdom, and whose presence all the world sought, was the span of a single generation. It may be pertinent to recall briefly the political conditions of the time as they appear in the written record. A nomadic people that had slowly gathered strength in the south seized a favorable opportunity, due probably to quarrels between the various Canaanitish tribes, to conquer the strongholds that commanded the northern trade routes. They set up their capital in the Canaanite city of Jerusalem. From that as a center they quickly overran and subdued most of Palestine. In the south they made themselves dominant. In the north they failed to do so. Military power in the first generation could impose a foreign rule over the conquered peoples, "even their children that were left after them in the land whom the children of Israel were not able utterly to destroy, and they were made bond servants".[16] But the yoke must have been a light one, and their laws

[16] I Kn. 9

and customs tolerated.[17] It seems significant that David and Solomon, the first two rulers of the new kingdom, took names that could be interpreted as recognizing alike the Tammuz cult and the God of Israel. The name of Adonijah, the pretender whom the high priest tried to set up as king in David's old age, may indicate an attempt of the puritan party to do away more fully with the native cults.[18] The episode of the Shunammite maiden who ministered to David in his last days is also suggestive.[19] Later commentary identifies the Shulamite of the Song of Songs with her and assumes her to have come from the village of Shunam, but the reverse is equally possible, and she may have been a votary of Shelem.

Solomon succeeded to the throne by selection of David. Among his first acts were the execution of the pretender Adonijah, the exile of the

---

[17] As to which see Sulzberger, *The Status of Labor in Ancient Israel*, Jewish Quarterly Review, Vol. III, Nos. 3 and 4. The *ger* or "stranger within thy gates" was the Canaanite serf, whose customs and rights the Israelite overlord had learned to respect and protect. Naturally, also, his cults were tolerated. Even as late as the time of Zechariah, a disapproving prophet had still to look to some future time when there should be "no more the Canaanite in the house of the Lord of hosts". (Zech. 14:21).

[18] I Kn. 5:14. In Jud. 1:21 it is said that the Jebusites were never driven out from their city, but that they "dwelt with the children of Benjamin in Jerusalem, unto this day".

[19] I Kn. 1:3

high priest and the appointment of another high priest of his own choosing.[20] He extended his power rapidly northward and built various store cities and strongholds on the coast in the north and in the desert—"store cities, cities for his chariots and cities for his horsemen, and he built further for his pleasure in Jerusalem and in Lebanon and in all the land of his dominion."[21] While he married a daughter of Pharaoh, King of Egypt, this did not limit the catholicity of his tastes, for we are told that he loved many foreign women, "women of the Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Zidonians and Hittites", and further that they turned away his heart after their gods, after "Ashtoreth the Goddess the Zidonians, and after Milcom the abomination of the Ammonites", and that all was not harmonious within his state is apparent: "and likewise did he for all his foreign wives who offered sacrifices unto their gods, and the Lord was angry with Solomon".[22] These foreign marriages implied political alliances, together with which came a period of reckless expenditure upon public improvements. The resources of the state were not equal to the demands of the king, and in that

[20] I Kn. 2
[21] I Kn. 9:17
[22] I Kn. 11

single reign its powers were dissipated. The prophecy of Abijah to Jeroboam is rather the recognition of unstable political conditions than a homily of religion: "I will rend the kingdom out of the hand of Solomon, and will give ten tribes to thee, but he shall have one tribe, for my servant David's sake, and for Jerusalem's sake, the city which I have chosen out of all the tribes of Israel—because that they have forsaken me, and have worshipped Ashtoreth the goddess of the Zidonians, Chemosh the god of Moab, and Milcom the god of the children of Ammon; and they have not walked in my ways, to do that which is right in mine eyes, and to keep my statutes and mine ordinances, as did David his father."[23] So the north went back frankly to its gods, while in the south the Jewish state continued, but never without its survivals of the earlier times,—the tolerated and assimilated customs of the "stranger within thy gates".

One of the most important improvements undertaken was the building of the temple and palace wherein centered the theocracy. David had planned this with Nathan the prophet, saying "I dwell in a house of cedar, but the ark

[23] I Kn. 11

of God dwelleth in curtains" and was answered with the approving oracle "Why have you not built Me a house of cedar?" The prophet went on to promise he should "build a house for My name and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever, and thy house and thy kingdom shall be made sure forever before thee; thy throne shall be established forever."[24]

Solomon took over and completed the work as David had wished. It is unnecessary to do more than recall how most of the materials were obtained from the north, from the region of Lebanon and Damascus through the King of Tyre. Their Tyrian origin was well remembered, and when Ezekiel in the exile wished to list for the encouragement of his people the sacred things that had been looted by the Babylonian conqueror, he did so by making a ship model of them and calling it Tyre.[25] The houses were built but they were not held sacred to the cult of Israel. On the contrary, it is said many times that they harbored other cults,—meaning in the speech of our day, that other religions had their rights under the law.

There is nothing intrinsically impossible, therefore, in the presence of the Tammuz cult

[24] 2 Sam. 7

[25] Ezek. 27. Cf. the writer's *The Ship Tyre*, Longmans 1920.

in the temple or in the survival in some form of its ceremonial. The expulsion from the temple of its votaries, both men and women, was an item of more than one political reform movement.[26] There is good reason to think that in the Song of Songs we have a bit of original Tammuz ritual overlaid with at least two additional strata: first, to adapt it to the conditions of the early kingdom; and second, to revive and further adapt it to the conditions of a much later kingdom. How continuously these ceremonies were observed we cannot hope to know, but remembering that a king does not necessarily rule, it is by no means impossible that ceremonial kings and queens were chosen during periods of foreign domination.

There grew up in the Jewish state a method of political expression which is familiar enough in our own day, and is found scattered throughout the books of the Old Testament—that of symbolizing the state as a natural object of some kind with features that refer to its principal institutions. This is the method of the political cartoonist. Characters like John Bull, the Goddess of Liberty, Uncle Sam, Miss Columbia, or, to take a material object, the Ship of State,

[26] 2 Kn. 23:7; Deut. 23:17; I Kn. 14:24, 15:12; Job 26:14. etc.

personify policies and current events. They change in features, avoirdupois, style of dress, according to the point the cartoonist wishes to emphasize in the news of the day. No one regards them as allegorical figures, yet that method of expression is essentially allegorical. Such methods are far more generally applied in Eastern than in Western countries. Simpson well said in his study of Jonah, "the Bible is an Oriental book full of Eastern thought, and it contains a great amount of allegories and symbols, but to the present day its expounders have been men of Western thought and with comparatively little knowledge of the East. The applications of Oriental forms of expression have received little or no favor in Scriptural exegesis". He goes on to remark of the "antipathy of theologians to figurative interpretation of Scripture", and quotes Hooker to the effect, " 'Where a passage would bear a literal interpretation the farthest from the letter was generally the worst; it is a dangerous kind of art, which, like alchemy, changeth the nature of metals; it maketh of anything what it listeth and in the end bringeth all truth to nothing' ". Hooker's words, as he says, "were no doubt justified by the efforts of writers in his time, and authors have repeated the same process since,

more correctly, the flower of the plain, or the lily of the valleys, is connected as she should be, with the flagons and apples of the Tammuz cult, but she is covered with the banners of the tribes about the tabernacle and located in the banqueting house that stood next to the temple.

The third chapter is almost entirely of the fabrics and ornaments of the temple, with the royal couch and chariots and the swords of the guard.

Chapters four to seven contain the personal descriptions of the figures in the ritual. In the fourth chapter the origin of the cult in Lebanon and Damascus clearly appears, and we have again the doves, the honey, the garden, springs and vineyards, pomegranates and other natural fruits that are connected with this cult wherever it appears, whether in Syria or Asia Minor, or in the pages of Homer, Theocritus or Ovid. One wonders whether the honey and raisin cakes of Ishtar did not sometimes find their way into the sanctuary as sacred offerings,[33] and whether the insistence upon unleavened bread and the barring of honey in the Jewish ritual did not reflect some party disagreements on that score. But if we examine the female

[33] Cf. Ezek. 27:17; Hos. 7:8; Jer. 7:18; 44:19.

figure in the fourth chapter, she has dove's eyes it is true, but according to the Septuagint they are within the veil; she has the goats' hair and fleece of the tabernacle; her lips are like the vermilion which was specified for the heave-offering;[34] she is likened to the tower of David with its bucklers and shields, and is perfumed with the myrrh, frankincense and ointments of the sacred oils and incense; and then to this are added the spikenard, saffron, aloes, and henna of the second temple. Search as you may, you will find no material detail that goes beyond these four institutions—the original cult, the tabernacle, and the first and second temples.

In the fifth chapter the male figure is described. He begins as before with the garden, honeycomb, wine and milk, dove's eyes, sweet flowers, lilies and Lebanon; but he acquires the myrrh, spices and frankincense of the temple, the coat and the golden chains and the washed feet of the priests, and enough of its jewels to suggest the breastplate. Again removal from

[34] "Thread of scarlet" is really "worm scarlet", that is, vermilion. We are not to suppose that thin lips were considered a sign of beauty. As to the dove, to Dr. A. H. Godbey I owe the suggestion that the wild blue rock-pigeon was the soul of the dead, in all the ancient world. *Peristera* in Greek is *perah Ishtar*, the tame house-pigeon. Cf. Cant. 2:14. So in Cant. 5:11, the raven also is an oracle from the dead.

the great outdoors to the public building is suggested by the closing reference to cedar. An interesting detail is the rivers of waters which the Septuagint renders "bowls of spices", and which may represent a transfer of the ritual from the Syrian stream of Adonis to the lavers and basins of the temple.

In the sixth chapter we have again the gardens and lilies, with a reference to the sun and moon and the misleading passage rendered Tirzah and Jerusalem,[35] which more probably contains names of the ceremonial actors; once more the garden, with its nuts, fruit, wine and pomegranate and the Shulamite who, like Jerusalem, began probably as Shulmanitu; but these figures gather to themselves the army with banners as it camped about the tabernacle, the goats' hair and the fleece of the tabernacle and the sanctuary; once more the vermilion; once more the army with banners and the chariots of the kings.

In the seventh chapter we are introduced to the Prince's daughter, who was certainly the Daughter of Jerusalem—that is, the national figure who gradually replaced the original figure

[35] Tirzah is literally "pleasure giver"; Jerusalem, we have seen, may be Uru-silim-ma, "stronghold of Shelem".

of the ceremony. Here we have the groundwork of wine, wheat, lilies, deer, palm tree, grapes, apples, vine, vineyards, pomegranates, mandrakes and pleasant fruits both new and old, with the same significant additions. Her feet are shod with shoes; probably, as on the feet of Ezekiel's foundling, the leather is the sealskin of the tabernacle.[36] She is adorned with the chains and jewels of the sanctuary, and likened to the house of Lebanon that adjoined the temple; her hair is purple like the hangings and the fabrics of the priests' garments. To the objection that this is a general phrase that has its parallel in Homer and many poets, it may be answered that it is but one detail in a list, all of which is taken from the sanctuary. The king is said to be held in the galleries, a *motif* of the cloister that connected the temple with the royal palace.

In the eighth chapter, to the spiced wine of pomegranates and the deer are added the seal of David and the wall and bulwarks of the palace, the door and cedar boards of the temple. An interesting bit of the law of offerings seems to survive in the passage about the thousand to Shelem and the two hundred to the keepers—

[36] Ezek. 16:10

Pages Misplaced

who evolved new meanings out of their inner consciousness and thus brought truth to nothing, or to anything the writers wished."[27]

It is well to remember, however, that most of the books in the Old Testament began as discussions of current events, or as records of law and ceremonial, and in interpreting them it is well to go back as nearly as possible to the events reflected in them. The Daughter of Jerusalem was one of these political figures. You find her pictured in many forms. She represented the state exactly as the Goddess of Liberty or Miss Columbia do today. When a prophet like Ezekiel wished to lecture his people for their failure to observe certain laws and ceremonies, he brought out his Daughter of Jerusalem as the Faithless Foundling, and was careful to clothe her in absolutely nothing but the substances of the sanctuary which he was upholding.[28] The same method was used by Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea and other writers on political subjects.[29]

---

[27] *The Jonah Legend*, 2-4

[28] Ezek. 16. Sulzberger, Jewish Quarterly Review, XIII: 260, quotes Josh. 9:20-23 to show the equation of the sanctuary with the public service, i.e. Commonwealth.

[29] Cf. e.g. Isa. 1:8, 3-26, 12:6, 23:10, 26:17-18, 47:1-5, 52:1-6, 54:1-17, 61:10, 62:11, 66:5-12; Jer. 3:1-5, 6-11, 20; 4:11, 31; 6:2, 14, 26-27; 7:29; 8:19; 9:1, 7; 12:7; 13:22-27; 30:14-17; Lam. 1:7-8, 17; 2:1, 13, 18; 4:6, 21-22; Ez. 16; 23; Hos. 2:1-12, 18-20; 9:1-2; Mic. 1:6-9; 4:13; 5:1; Nah. 3:4-7; Zeph. 3:14-17; Zech. 2:7-8; 2:10; 9:9.

In later times we find, in the Service for Purim, the state personified as the Lily of Jacob.[30] And again, this personifying tendency finds such expression as the Hymn to the Sabbath which turns the Sabbath day into a bride, clothed and adorned with many things regarded as important.[31] It would be a mistake to regard this as altogether the product of mediaeval times. There are many indications that it represents very early traditions and tendencies.

There is indeed a note of caution in the Jewish prayer book following one of these typical cases of personification to the effect that "where Biblical verses are employed not in a strictly literal sense, it is to be observed that the Rabbis, like other preachers, made use of such passages for homiletical purposes as illustrations of their meaning rather than as logical foundations for their teaching."[32] The Song of Songs seems clearly to be a piece of writing of this kind. It began as an early Canaanitish ritual. It received additions as that ritual was adapted, under protest by the prophetic party, to the temple services at Jerusalem. Later it passed into political discussion on the figurative side.

---

[30] Standard Prayer Book, 423
[31] Standard Prayer Book, 246-7
[32] *ibid.* 278

These steps follow one another in a natural way. It is not necessary to assume the acceptance in late historical times of the customs or beliefs of the earlier cult, nor is it necessary on the other hand to assume that the traditional interpretation which connects the book with political institutions in figurative form is arbitrary or fictitious. With Uncle Sam and Miss Columbia that is actually the case. It would be rather amusing to write a love story for them, and it is surprising when one thinks of it, that this has not been done. We should find the same lack of distinguishing characteristics as to sex, relationships, etc., that are so evident in the earlier book. However, in the case of the Song of Songs the celebrants in a ritual have survived as political figures.

I know of no better way to make this thought clear than by analyzing the substances mentioned in the various chapters of the book. I concur with the view that there are only two figures in the Song; that they are described under various characteristics in accordance with some ceremonial to which we no longer have the key. In every chapter, analysis of the substances mentioned leads to the same conclusion. There was an original list in which there were mentioned only the things connected with the

Tammuz-Ishtar cult. To this there were additions that tied the cult in some sort of way to the accounts of the tabernacle and first temple as they appear in Exodus and I Kings, and to this finally were added things connected with the second temple as they appear in the Talmudic passage already quoted. It is an arbitrary adaptation.

In the first chapter there is a groundwork of wine and vineyards, flocks and doves, and the like. To this are added the tents, curtains, chains, borders and studs of the tabernacle, the ointments, veils (if we follow the Septuagint which here, as elsewhere, probably gives a less fluid text in details of this kind), horses, chariots, jewels and myrrh. The Tammuz cult was one of gardens and groves, with the sun, moon and stars as witnesses. How arbitrarily this was transferred to a public building is indicated in the closing passage "our couches are leaves, the beams of our house are cedar, and the panels are cypress." To this account are added the spikenard and henna of the post-exilic temple. Here I assume that the unidentified plant, *kippath*, of the Talmud is the same as *kopher*, henna, which involves the slightest possible change in the manuscript.

In the second chapter the Rose of Sharon, or

perhaps the priests. And in the remark, "many waters cannot quench love", what have we but the "waters under the earth" into which Tammuz descended and from which Ishtar rescued him?

In recapitulation, and subject, of course, to generous correction, there appear to be in the eight chapters of the Song of Songs 134 references to things suited to the ancient Tammuz cult, 126 to things specified of the tabernacle, the first temple and palace, and 7 to things of the second temple. Of the things added to the original list, most are foreign in nature and use and would have had no place in an original Tammuz ritual, nor in the markets and trade of its time. Nor had the Tammuz cult offerings any place in the ceremonial of the sanctuary as specified in the Pentateuch. As adapted, however, to a ceremonial use, perhaps only occasional and in recognition of a Tammuz party existent within the state, and always numerous, they appear to reflect an effort to make the earlier cult suitable in some way to the later conditions. Ezekiel tells us of the women of Jerusalem who mourned for Tammuz,[37] and there is no reason to suppose that

[37] Ezek. 8:14

the cult ever entirely died out. A passage in Zechariah, usually regarded as late, speaks of it as persisting at Megiddo[38] and, by no means impossibly, at Jerusalem. As I have shown elsewhere, it was sufficiently widespread in the reign of Tiberius for a ship pilot to be confused by it off the coast of Epirus, perhaps because of the presence of Syrian colonies there.[39]

> "Jerusalem the golden
> With milk and honey blest"

was how Bernard of Cluny figured the mystical Paradise of the future; but he began by emphasizing features of the Jerusalem of the land of Canaan "flowing with milk and honey" which were barred, as idolatrous, from the Jewish sanctuary.

It may be a far cry from an Oriental Goddess of Love with her many names, Ishtar, Shulmanitu, Aphrodite, Venus, to the Daughter of Jerusalem, the bride of Yahweh, or the Holy Catholic Church. It is a far cry also from Tammuz or Adonis to Yahweh himself, or to the

---

[38] Zech. 12:11. See also 2 Kn. 23:4, as to which Dr. Godbey suggests that the "fields of Kidron" were, in fact, the groves of the mourning festival. The citron, which in Jewish ritual replaced the pomegranate of the Tammuz-Ishtar cult, was also grown in "kosher" ground only—and brides of our own day wear orange blossoms most appropriately!

[39] *Tammuz, Pan and Christ*, Open Court, Sept. 1912, Aug. 1913

bridegroom of the Apocalypse with his "Behold, I stand at the door and knock,"[40] so well conceived in the beautiful painting by George Watts; but the connection of both with the original types is unbroken and unmistakable.

When the Song of Songs acquired its later additions cannot perhaps be determined from its text. It could have been written as it stands by someone familiar with the development of the tradition, just as Josephus wrote his histories. On the other hand the fact that it was written in Hebrew and not in Aramaic, in a northern dialect, and that its incorporations of new matter with old are so obvious and sometimes so clumsy, rather seems to point toward a progressive development of the text, and toward an original form quite as old as the time of David and Solomon with whom it is connected. The treatment of details points in the same direction. Most of the passages in it which would offend the taste of a later and more conventional day, have been carefully covered over with references to things of the sanctuary

[40] Rev. 3:20. Contrary to the view of Dr. Montgomery, as expressed in this volume, I regard this passage as a direct citation from the Song, 5:2. The Apocalypse is too full of intentional citations from the Hebrew Scriptures to regard any identity in expression as accidental. Cf. Grinfield's Hellenistic New Testament *ad loc.*

in such a way as to conceal or weaken their original meaning.[41] The breastplate has been substituted for the fig leaf.

To this text I would append Psalm 45 which, although included in the popular hymnal, was probably a song that belonged originally to this ritual. Other psalms, in the same way, appear in II Samuel. Haupt interprets this Psalm as written for the wedding of a certain Princess of the Maccabees. But it would answer just as well for that of Ptolemy Epiphanes and Cleopatra. From the allusions contained in its verses it seems more likely to have been applied to a periodical and ceremonial wedding of the representative of the Goddess as a national figure. Here we seem to have the same development from primitive to later culture. Beginning with swords and arrows sinking into the heart of the enemy, going on to the throne, the

[41] As to which see Haupt, *The Book of Canticles*, AJSLL, July and October, 1902. I question whether "Tarshish" always meant the region back of the Gulf of Cadiz; the word itself could refer, like the "wretched Cush" of the Egyptians, to any alien people regarded as inferior; and on 5:14 there may be some light in Strabo, XVI. I.20. "Tarshish" as the name of the stone does not necessarily refer to its place of origin, but can mean "broken", that is, a crystal (e.g., quartz or beryl) with a cleavage that refracts light into colored rays. Rihbany, *The Syrian Christ*, pp. 352 ff., has some pertinent suggestions as to the Semitic point of view in these personal descriptions, so abundant in vernacular songs, which he regards as artistic rather than seductive in purpose.

sceptre and the anointing oil and ending with things altogether of the first and second temples, myrrh, aloes and cassia, ivory, stringed instruments, gold of Ophir, checkered work, richly woven stuff, all refer, like Ezekiel's ship model, to a Daughter of Tyre who is Jerusalem. History in a nutshell if you will, in a kindergarten method, but remarkably effective for all that in keeping alive the national spirit under difficulties.[42]

Jastrow balked at the rabbinical musings on the sacred significance of the substances mentioned in the Song, and regarded them as mystical and unreal;[43] but he did not distinguish between the various lists that are incorporated in the book. Once we grasp the idea that the original Tammuz nature-list has been overlaid with a second list embodying the most sacred symbols of the Jewish state from tabernacle

---

[42] There is a curious legend of Melchizedek, found among the works of St. Athanasius. He is set forth as the "son of King Melchi and Queen Salem", whom one may easily identify with Ishtar Urusilim-ma and her *Dodi* or *Adoni*, Tammuz. He was converted to a belief in the true God, and at his prayer his whole kindred was swallowed up in the earth at the moment when his father was about to sacrifice his other son Melchi to idols. Melchizedek then lived as a hermit on Mt. Tabor until Abraham, divinely guided, found him. (James, *Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament*, 17-18). Here seem to be echoes of some early controversies between Canaanite and Israelite elements in Palestine. Cf. also Ps. 110.

[43] *The Song of Songs*, Lippincott 1921, Ch. III

through temple and palace to second temple, their meaning becomes clear. They have a sacred significance because they were inserted there for that very purpose—not because the original list included them. It did nothing of the sort. And their sacredness is on the political side.

The list of the Therumah or heave offering in Exodus must have been the starting point of the national political philosophy. Go into that golden land flowing with milk and honey, that Tammuz land, said Yahweh, and if you will make me a dwelling place of these certain things, I will come into it and abide with you and give you power and riches. Such was the covenant as taught to the school boys of Jerusalem. It must have been made as familiar to them as the Declaration of Independence to American boys. Perhaps in each case only the opening lines were ever thoroughly memorized. "When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume, among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind" etc. etc., would thus parallel "of

every man whose heart maketh him willing, ye shall take My offering. And this is the offering which ye shall take of them: gold, and silver, and brass; and blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine linen, and goats' hair; and rams' skins dyed red, and sealskins, and acacia-wood; oil for the light, spices for the anointing oil, and for the sweet incense; onyx stones, and stones to be set, for the ephod, and for the breastplate. And let them make Me a sanctuary, that I may dwell among them."[44] How readily in such case would any allusion to those items, however fleeting, bring to the mind of the hearer the institution of the state erected on that foundation! When the state is personified as a female character, clothed and adorned with these same substances, the sex symbolism readily follows. The coming of Yahweh is then to the woman, rather than to the sanctuary. The idea is the same as that of Ezekiel's faithless foundling and wanton sisters differently applied. The Song of Songs in its final form must have made a strong appeal politically to its generation. It was addressed to people still more or less familiar with the ancient Tammuz cult, especially to the substantial element still surviving

[44] Ex. 25

among them who, because of earlier racial affiliations, would have been under strong pressure from the governing power to abandon Judaism and embrace the Hellenistic cults of Adonis and Aphrodite. It strengthened their national spirit by assuring them that the true Adonis was Yahweh and the true Aphrodite the Daughter of Jerusalem. It recognized the existence of a Tammuz or Canaanite party within the Jewish state, for whose defection the Hellenistic administration was bidding. It claimed their allegiance in the language of their ancient spring-festival ritual suitably re-edited to meet the conditions of the time.[45]

The reconstruction of the original text of the Song has often been attempted, but apparently without success. I suggest that the best guess would be to eliminate all the substances of the Therumah and its appendant lists and to restore to its couplets the substances and things connected with the Tammuz cult which they

[45] Cryptic writing on political subjects was characteristic of both time and race. Compare the cautions laid down in Eccl. 10:20, and the political menagerie in I Enoch 85-90. Haupt cites a common saying at Damascus, *alhanx min Yahudi*, "more fond of veiled allusions than a Jew"; and Mohammed makes a like remark: (Koran 4:48) "there are those of the Jews who twist words from their meaning, and say, We have heard and have resisted; but hear thou without understanding".

displaced. The resulting text might give us a true picture of the primitive festival; it would also be unprintable and were best left undone. We have early parallels in abundance, for example in the Gilgamesh Epic.

The Song of Songs is an epitome of racial assimilation in Palestine. When the Canaanite was reduced to serfdom his ritual observances were excluded from the sanctuary, but he was too substantial an element in the population to be submerged and his ceremonies had too human an appeal to be permanently put aside. They remained where the sayings of many a priest and prophet were lost. As assimilated by the ruling class they helped to knit overlord and serf together into a body politic. That process was but strengthened by foreign persecutions. Nineveh and Babylon fell before combinations of foreign enemies with discontented elements within their boundaries, but in Palestine Antiochus failed to bring about such division, as had Nebuchadrezzar and Sennacherib before him, and their failure is in part reflected in this survival of one of the most charming ceremonial productions of a youthful world, wherein the Joys had not yet been routed utterly by the Glooms.

THE LISTS COMPARED

In the following pages an effort has been made to classify the material allusions in the Song according to the cults to which they are supposed to refer. Allusions to the Ishtar cult have been well studied in Professor Meek's paper. References to the early sanctuaries—that is, the tabernacle and the first temple—may easily be traced in the historical accounts, particularly in Exodus, Numbers and I Kings. References to the later sanctuaries are thought to be found in the substances that imply trade with India or beyond, and are necessarily of the Persian or Greek periods.

		Ishtar Cult	*Early Sanctuaries*	*Later Santuaries*
I.	1.	Wine	Ointments	
	2.		Chambers	
	4.		Tents	
	5.		Curtains	
	6.	Vineyards		
	7.	Flock	Veil	
	8.	Kids	Tents	
	9.		Steed	
			Chariot	
	10.		Circlets	
			Pearls	
	11.		Beads	
			Studs	
			Gold	
			Silver	
	12.	King	Table	Spikenard
	13.		Myrrh	

		Ishtar Cult	*Early Sanctuaries*	*Later Sanctuaries*
	14.	Vineyard		Henna
	15.	Doves		
	16.	Couch	Beams	
			Cedar	
			Panels	
			Cypress	
II.	1.	Rose		
		Lily		
	2.	Thorn		
	3.	Apple		
		Fruit	Banqueting house	
	4.		Banner	
	5.	Dainties		
		Apples		
	7.	Gazelles		
		Hinds		
	9.	Hart	Wall	
			Windows	
			Lattice	
	12.	Flowers		
		Turtle dove		
	13.	Fig-tree		
		Vines		
	14.	Dove		
	15.	Foxes		
		Vineyards		
		Blossoms		
	16.	Lilies		
	17.	Gazelle	Spices	
		Hart		
III.	1	Bed	City	
	2.		Streets	
	3.		Watchman	
			House	
			Chamber	
	4.	Gazelles		

		Ishtar Cult	*Early Sanctuaries*	*Later Sanctuaries*
	5.	Hinds		
	6.		Wilderness	
			Smoke	
			Myrrh	
			Frankencense	
			Powders	
	7.		Litter	
			60 men	
	8.		Sword	
	9.			Palanquin
			Wood of Lebanon	
	10		Pillars	
			Silver	
			Top	
			Gold	
			Seat	
			Purple	
			Crown	
IV.	1.	Doves	Veil	
			Goats	
			Gilead	
	2.		Ewes	
	3.	Pomegranate	Vermilion	
			Veil	
	4.		Tower of David	
			Turrets	
			Shields	
			Armor	
			Men	
	5.	Fawns		
		Gazelle		
		Lilies		
	6.		Myrrh	
			Frankincense	

		Ishtar Cult	*Early Sanctuaries*	*Later Sanctuaries*
	8.	Lebanon		
		Amana		
		Senir		
		Hermon		
		Lions		
		Leopards		
	9.	Sister	Necklace	
		Bride		
	10.	Wine	Ointments	
			Spices	
	11.	Honey		
		Milk	Garments	
		Lebanon		
	12.	Garden		
		Spring		
		Fountain		
	13.	Shoots		Henna
		Park		Spikenard
		Pomegranates		
		Fruits		
	14.		Calamus	Saffron
			Cinnamon (?)	
			Frankincense	
			Myrrh	Aloes (?)
	15.	Gardens		
		Waters		
		Lebanon		
	16.	Gardens	Spices	
		Fruits		
V.	1.	Garden	Myrrh	
			Spice	
		Honeycomb		
		Honey		
		Wine		
		Milk		
	2.	Dove		
		Dew		

		Ishtar Cult	*Early Sanctuaries*	*Later Sanctuaries*
	3.		Coat	
			Washed feet	
			Door	
	4.		Myrrh	
			Flowing myrrh	
	7.		Watchmen	
			Walls	
			Mantles	
	10.	White		
		Ruddy		
	11.	Gold		
		Curled locks		
		Raven		
	12.	Doves	Settings	
		Water-brooks		
		Milk		
	13.	Sweet herbs		
		Lilies	Flowing myrrh	
	14.		Rods of Gold	
			Beryls	
			Ivory	
			Sapphires	
	15.	Lebanon	Pillars of marble	
			Fine gold	
			Cedars	
VI.	2.	Garden	Spices	
		Lilies		
	3.	Lilies		
	4.	Tirzah	Army	
		Jerusalem	Banners	
	5.		Hair	
			Goats	
			Gilead	
	6.		Ewes	
	7.	Pomegranates	Veil	
	8.	Maidens	Queens	
			Concubines	

		Ishtar Cult	*Early Sanctuaries*	*Later Sanctuaries*
	9.	Dove		
	10.	Moon	Army	
		Sun	Banners	
	11.	Garden		
		Nuts		
		Green plants		
		Vine budded		
		Pomegranate	Chariots	
		Flowers		
VII.	1.	Shulamite		
		Dance	Companies	
	2.	Prince's daughter	Sandals	
			Links of a chain	
	3.	Wine	Goblet	
		Heap of wheat		
		Lilies		
	4.	Fawns		
		Gazelle		
	5.		Tower of ivory	
			Pools	
			Gate	
		Lebanon	Tower	
		Damascus	Galleries	
		King		
	6.	Carmel	Hair	
		King	Purple	
	8.	Palm-tree		
		Grapes		
	9.	Vine		
		Apples		
	10.	Wine		
	12.	Vineyards		
	13.	Vine-blossom		
		Pomegranate-flower		
	14.	Mandrakes		
		Precious Fruits		

		Ishtar Cult	*Early Sanctuaries*	*Later Sanctuaries*
VIII.	2.		House	
			Spiced wine	
	4.	Daughter of Jerusalem		
	5.	Apple tree	Wilderness	
	6.		Seal	
			Fire	
			Flame of the Lord	
	7.	Waters		
	8.	Little sister		
	9.		Wall	
			Turret of silver	
			Door	
			Boards of cedar	
	10.	Peace	Wall	
		(– Salem)	Towers	
	11.	Solomon		
		Vineyard		
		Baal-hamon		
		Keepers	1000 pieces silver	
		Fruit		
	12.	Vineyard		
		Solomon 1000		
		Keepers 200		
		Fruit		
	13.	Gardens		
		Companions		
	14.	Gazelle	Mountains	
		Young hart	of spices	

SUMMARY

	Ishtar Cult	*Early Sanctuaries*	*Later Sanctuaries*
I.	8	20	2
II.	21	6	..
III.	3	21	1
IV.	29	22	4
V.	18	19	..
VI.	15	13	..
VII.	23	10	..
VIII.	17	14	..
	134	126	7

WEEK RESERVE

Date Due

JUL 31 1982
APR 29 1983
MAR 26 1984
APR 28 1985
APR 16 '86
APR 27 19[illegible]
APR 25 1973
MAY 6 1973
MAY 17 1973
MAR 3 1981
APR 6 1981
FEB 28 1984
APR 6 1984
4-13
JUN 11 1987

CENTRAL BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
0 0021 0023004 0

223.9011
S367

Schoff, Wilfred Harvey, ed.
AUTHOR

The Song of songs.
TITLE

223.9011
S367 Schoff, Wilfred Harvey, ed.
The Song of songs.

N12716